DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 541 UD 013 507

AUTHOR	Shanner, William M.
TITLE	Procedures for the Preparation of Descriptions on Assessment of Exemplary Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Information Dissemination.
REPORT NO	AIR-20200-4-73-FR
BUREAU NO	BR-2-0200
PUB DATE	Apr 73
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-3674
NOTE	140p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Information Dissemination; Inner City; Instructional Innovation; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Secondary Education; Spanish Speaking; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The chief purpose of this project was to prepare descriptions of exemplary programs in childhood education and reading having sufficient merit to be considered as visitation sites for other educators. The childhood education phase of this project was funded jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education. Its purpose was to select and document a variety of programs including Head Start, Follow Through, elementary and secondary programs in inner city schools, programs for Spanish-Speaking, and programs in basic skills and vocational areas for initial dissemination through the six Regional and National White House Conferences. In addition it was planned that OEO and OE could use the print and nonprint materials developed by the project for independent dissemination efforts. The exemplary reading programs phase of the project involved the field assessment of selected programs related to reading instruction and the verification of their effectiveness as demonstration sites for visits by personnel from other school districts. Program descriptions and leaflets were prepared for the 37 reading programs and 34 childhood education programs. Audio-visual documentation was prepared for 12 childhood education programs. This project was one in a series directed toward the wider dissemination of new and innovative practices in education, and was funded by the Office of Information Dissemination of OE. (Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AIR-20200-4/73-FR

ED 075541

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 20200

Contract No. OEC-0-70-3674

PROCEDURES FOR THE PREPARATION OF DESCRIPTIONS ON ASSESSMENT OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

William M. Shanner

American Institutes for Research
in the Behavioral Sciences
Palo Alto, California

April 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Office of Information Dissemination

UD 013507

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SUMMARY

The chief purpose of this project was the preparation of descriptions of exemplary programs in childhood education and reading having sufficient merit to be considered as visitation sites for other educators. Two types of written descriptions were prepared for each exemplary program: (1) a short, condensed six-page fan-folded leaflet suitable for direct mailing or hand-out purposes; and (2) a 20 to 30 page detailed description, including a statement of the program's objectives, content, methods, costs, and benefits. Program descriptions and leaflets were prepared for 37 reading programs. Program descriptions and leaflets were prepared for 34 childhood education programs. Audio-visual documentation was prepared for 12 childhood education programs. The childhood education materials were utilized in the national and regional White House Conferences on Children and Youth. The program descriptions were prepared in camera-ready format specified by the Office of Education and suitable for printing by the United States Government Printing Office. Thirty-three childhood education program descriptions and leaflets were printed and are available from the United States Government Printing Office. Ten reading program descriptions were printed and are available from the United States Government Printing Office.

This project was one in a series directed toward the wider dissemination of new and innovative practices in education. It was funded by the Office of Information Dissemination of the Office of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful first and foremost to the many people -- superintendents, principals, teachers -- who gave time especially during our site visits to tell us about their programs and to answer our questions. What they said added immeasurably to the descriptive reports, and without their help the program descriptions could not have been prepared.

The editorial support and cooperation of Mrs. Mildred J. Thorne, Office of Education, is also greatly appreciated.

This study was the work of a team at AIR which included at various times Joan Altick, Richard Bond, Emily Campbell, Norman Carter, Caroline Dillman, Phyllis Dubois, Marie Freeman, Nona Gamel, William Hartley, Jane Kilkenny, Mary Ann King, Evelyn Meyers, Debra Michaels, Sarah Morris, Daryl Nichols, Carol Ordal, Marvin Patterson, Harold Rahmlow, Barbara Sanderson, Robert Weisgerber, and Mary Willis.

William M. Shanner
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter I - INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter II - CHILDHOOD EDUCATION SERIES	4
Selection of Programs	4
Site Visit Preparation	6
Inventory of Program Data	7
Program Descriptions	10
Audio-Visual Documentation	11
Chapter III - EXEMPLARY READING PROGRAMS	12
Selection of Programs	12
Site Visit Preparations and Procedures	14
Program Descriptions	16
Classification of Reading Programs	18
Chapter IV - RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR SITE VISITS	20
Selection of a Program to be Visited	21
Preparation Beforehand	22
Procedures to be Followed at the Site	23
Preparation of the Interview Instrument	25
Chapter V - SUMMARY	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32
Appendix A - Thirty-Four Model Programs in Childhood Education for which Descriptive Brochures were Published by United States Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity	A-1
Appendix B - Inventory Forms for Data Collected for Childhood Education Programs for White House Conference on Children and Youth	B-1
Appendix C - Twelve Childhood Education Programs which were Documented by Audio-Visual Presentations	C-1

Page

Appendix D - Disposition of 45 Federally-Supported Reading Projects Recommended by Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) as Exemplary Reading Programs D-1

Appendix E - Five Exemplary Reading Programs in Adult Basic Education Selected for Site Visits and Documentation from Recommendations of the Division of Adult Education Programs, United States Office of Education E-1

Appendix F - Six Exemplary Reading Programs Identified by the American Institutes for Research and Approved by United States Office of Education as Substitutes for Programs Eliminated from Initial List Supplied by the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education F-1

Appendix G - Inventory Forms for Data Collected for Exemplary Reading Programs G-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Summary of Disposition of Programs in Reading for Inclusion in this Study	15
II	Ten Exemplary Reading Programs Classified with Respect to Program Characteristics	19

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The chief products of this study have been descriptive reports of selected educational programs in reading and childhood education. These descriptive reports are inventoried in the Appendices of this final document. Each of these programs has represented innovative and renewed efforts by school districts and other agencies to improve the quality of the outcomes of these programs. While carefully designed evaluation studies and hard data have not, in most cases, been available to demonstrate measured benefits of cognitive achievement, the programs themselves have been received with enthusiasm by teachers, students, and parents. In the midst of responding to do something about the problems of reading and childhood education, educational research administrators and others have apparently assumed that the success or failure of the program would be self-evident.

The process of change in education is very slow. It has often been said that a time span of fifty years is necessary to introduce new educational practices into half of the classrooms. Research reports and evaluation studies of successful programs do not result in the automatic and instantaneous introduction of the practices of these successful programs into other schools. There is also considerable time lag in waiting for teacher training institutions to train new teachers in the new practices to replace the older teachers. Other problems not facilitating the dissemination of new practices into the school result from the inadequate communication of the outcomes of promising programs and the lack of opportunity for educators to observe exemplary programs in operation and to discuss their benefits, costs, training and staffing requirements and other features with educators who developed and operate them.

Recently the Office of Information Dissemination of the Office of Education began a program to close the gap between development of exemplary programs and their widespread adoption by other schools. As an initial first step, the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education of the Office of Education, in cooperation with the 54 State and Territorial Educational Agencies, identified selected successful programs which had been in operation for more than one year. The research supported under this project constituted a second

step. The purpose of this project was to carry out a "field assessment of these selected programs relating to reading instruction to verify their effectiveness and to recommend which of the exemplary sites held promise of being effective demonstration sites for other school districts." Carefully prepared usable program descriptions which could be widely disseminated were to be prepared for each exemplary reading program.

At the initial meeting (April 28-29, 1970) between AIR project leaders and Office of Education personnel following the award of the research project to AIR, a modification was suggested to include documentation of innovative programs for childhood education to meet requirements for the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

In brief, the work to be performed for the White House Conference was to provide similar documentation to that planned for the exemplary reading programs for innovative programs in childhood learning in areas other than reading and through such programs as those of the Bureau of the Handicapped, Head Start, Follow Through, etc. In addition, audio-visual presentations not to exceed 10 minutes were to be provided for some of the programs documented. Emphasis was to be placed on imaginative, suggestive programs, rather than on programs which could be validated as effective at the time. Approximately half of the programs selected were to be outside conventional school settings (e.g., OEO and OCD types of programs). Selection of the programs to be included were to be based upon recommendations by the leaders of the Learning Panels for the regional conferences.

As a result of this meeting the scope of work of the project was enlarged to provide for documentation of both childhood education and reading programs, and the schedule for completion of the reading phase of the work was altered to follow completion of the childhood education phase.

The sections of this report that follow discuss the procedures and activities conducted for the documentation of and development of audio-visual presentations of the childhood education programs and the exemplary reading programs. These documentations were submitted individually and separately to the Office of Education. Certain of them have been published and are available through the United States Government Printing Office (see Appendices A, D, E, and F).

Detailed information about the organization, procedures, and research activities carried on by AIR's Research Staff for this project are reported in a publication of The Oregon Studies in Educational Research, Development, Diffusion, and Evaluation, Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon.* AIR's project, "The Assessment of Exemplary Reading Projects," was one of twenty research projects studied in depth and reported as a Case Study Profile by the University of Oregon Research Group.

The case study profile describes the essential characteristics of AIR's project and the work requirements in it. Included in the Oregon report are: (a) the general characteristics of the AIR project, e.g., objectives, time lines, organizational structures, and project "dynamics;" (b) the characteristics of the personnel working within the project, including background of training, work experience, and job role definitions; and (c) the work requirements within the project. The data reported in the case study describes the outputs of the work effort, the standards established for those outputs, the operations required to produce outputs to specific standards, and the knowledges, skills, and sensitivities needed to carry out the operations.

---

* Ammerman, Harry L., Clukey, Darrell, and Thomas, Gregory P., Editors. Profiles of Exemplary Projects in Educational RDD&E, Part Three. Pp. 1269-1342. Monmouth, Oregon: Teaching Research, 1972.

A project supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Education; National Center for Educational Research and Development. Grant No. OEG-0-70-4977; Project No. 0-0701.

Chapter II

CHILDHOOD EDUCATION SERIES

The Childhood Education phase of this project was funded jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Office of Education (OE). Its purpose was to select and document a variety of programs including Head Start, Follow Through, elementary and secondary programs in inner-city schools, programs for Spanish-speaking, and programs in basic skills and vocational areas for initial dissemination through the six Regional and National White House Conferences. In addition it was planned that OEO and OE could use the print and nonprint materials developed by the project for independent dissemination efforts.

Selection of Programs

Initial plans called for OEO and OE to select programs for dissemination with AIR being given the responsibility of identifying additional unusually promising educational programs.

In selecting early childhood education programs to be documented for the White House Conference on Children, the emphasis was on imaginative and promising innovative programs, not necessarily those showing validation of effectiveness. Also emphasis was on the inclusion of programs outside conventional school settings. To fit in with the regional conferences scheduled in addition to the national White House Conference, programs were to be selected in each of six geographical regions.

Some variables considered in choosing a representative group of programs were:

- Ethnic or other special group (Black, Indian, migrant, etc.)
- Community served (urban, rural, suburban, mixed)
- Age group (0-5; 6-9; 10-13)
- Socioeconomic status (disadvantaged, middle class, etc.)

- Type of program (Head Start, Follow Through, day care, special education, community action, etc.)
- Program focus (cognitive, bilingual, Montessori, parental involvement, etc.)

The starting point for program selection was a list of approximately 100 programs recommended by the 11 regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Eight out of the total 33 programs finally documented came from this initial list, which was entirely composed of preschool and day care programs.

Further recommendations were solicited from the Office of Education and a literature search was undertaken to develop a pool of early childhood education programs from which to choose programs for more intensive followup. The Regional Laboratories of the Office of Education were also contacted, as well as the Day Care Center of the U. S. Department of Labor and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. The Appalachian Regional Commission furnished a list of programs from a current study in that area.

Of more than 200 programs identified as possibilities, approximately half were screened by telephone or letter to obtain more detailed information. By far the most common reasons for dropping programs from further consideration at this stage were insufficient guarantee of continuation and lack of replicability features. A resulting list of 35 programs scheduled to be visited was cleared with the Office of Education. After preparations for site visiting were in progress it was discovered that five or six programs were being documented for the White House Conference by other organizations through the U. S. Office of Child Development. This duplication led to a renewed search for substitute programs.

Thirty-four programs were visited and documented. One of these was eliminated by the Office of Education in the final publication stage. The final list of 34 model childhood education programs is given in Appendix A.

Selection of 12 of the programs for audio-visual documentation was done later. Based on snapshots taken during many of the site visits, and giving preference to programs having little or no existing audio-visual presentations, a decision was made as to which programs would best lend themselves to this treatment. Each of the six White House Conference regions was represented.

Site Visit Preparation

To cover the most ground in the least amount of time is the basic purpose of a productive site visit. Some programs which have attracted wide interest are used to being visited; their attitude toward visitors and the extent to which they are prepared for them range from a structured "public relations" approach to disorganized indifference or even annoyance. Other programs less exposed to this kind of attention may welcome visitors or may show varying amounts of diffidence, but are almost always ill-prepared for site visitors in terms of either staff time or organized information. In any of these cases, or combinations thereof, visiting places a burden on site personnel that, while unavoidable, must be minimized if the visit is to be effective. The time and cost to the site visitor is an equal consideration, along with the necessity to extract meaningful information.

Because of the need to obtain a great deal of specific program information in a short period of time it was necessary to develop a site visit routine which would insure that all necessary information was obtained with a minimum burden upon school and program personnel.

With this in mind, the site visiting strategy had three objectives within the context of gathering comparable data for the description and assessment of the programs studied:

1) to develop an adequate check list and inventory instrument for collecting the required data;

2) to review all available program documentation prior to the visit and, in turn, make clear to site personnel the nature of additional information requirements;

3) to direct on-site data gathering toward questions specific to the program brought out by the preparatory program review.

Inventory of Program Data

The development of an Inventory of Program Data to insure accurate and comprehensive collection of data on program operation was based on previous AIR studies in the assessment and description of educational programs.* An inventory form was prepared for these previous studies and was revised to fit assessment criteria for the childhood education programs. The checklist was designed to be comprehensive without overburdening program personnel and to collect maximum specific information while not overstructuring the discussion and losing unforeseen data of significance. On the basis of experience in the first two site visits, the checklist was again modified. The final site visit checklist contained close to 100 specific items under the following main section headings:

- Program Identification
- Historical Development and Objectives
- Community Factors
- Personnel
- Pupil Characteristics
- Learner Activities and Method ology
- Measurement and Evaluation

---

* Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, September 1968.

Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., DeWitt, K. M., & Trickett, P. K. A study of further selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, June 1969.

Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., & Trickett, P. K. Preparing evaluation reports: A guide for authors. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

The headings correspond generally to the format for presenting and summarizing the data in the final program descriptions. A certain amount of overlap among questions under different headings was purposely built in to provide a cross-check. The complete form is given in Appendix C.

Program Review. Whenever possible, the attempt was made to insure continuity by having the site visitor maintain all contact with program personnel from initial telephone interview to final follow-up. Likewise, the effort was made to relate to a single knowledgeable and cooperative program staff member in making arrangements and appointments and securing access to the required information. Especially in large programs, there may be a tendency, in the absence of such an effort, for the inquirer to be handed from one staff member to another with no one feeling responsible for coordination.

In the telephone interview conducted in the selection of sites, a request was made for all available written material relating to the program. In preparation for a visit, this material was carefully reviewed against the Inventory of Program Data in order to record data in documents about programs in advance and thus limit as many on-site questions as possible to simple confirmation or clarification. Site visitors then approached the actual visit with background familiarity with the program and a knowledge of where to concentrate their inquiries. In the cases where time and scheduling pressures, or lack of program documentation, precluded a thorough preview of this kind, site visitors felt handicapped to the extent of at least one full day's orientation at the site.

At the time of the scheduling of the visit, program personnel were informed of the identified areas of concentration and given a general idea of the lines of inquiry that would be followed. Part of this was essential in making sure to see the proper people. In addition, it was hoped -- not always guaranteed -- that some of the required requested information would be gathered prior to arrival.

On-Site Visit and Follow-up. Generally, staff visitors had prior appointments with the project director and perhaps one other key staff member. These were supplemented whenever possible by visits to classrooms or wherever learner activities were taking place and with operating personnel such as teachers or specialists. In the case of visits made over the summer, however, observation of the program in operation was not always possible. Contacts with teachers and other operating personnel were usually not formal interviews but rather gave the visitor an opportunity to cross-check or elucidate in informal conversation information already obtained.

The nature of the on-the-spot situation structured the course of the visit. For example, the project director might respond to a line of questioning by saying that someone else on the staff could provide a much better picture than he could, and an interview with that person would then be arranged. Often the site visitor discovered leads to significant aspects of the program which were not anticipated, extending the questioning accordingly or asking to talk to other personnel.

Some site visitors tape-recorded their impressions; all amplified their interview notes at the first opportunity. Often this was done in the evening at the local hotel, and points verified or missing data gathered in discussions at the site on the following day.

Immediately on their return, site visitors were responsible for preparing a rough draft descriptive report based on their interview notes and any new printed material obtained at the site. Letter or telephone follow-ups were made to secure missing details and clarify discrepancies.

As expected, data on both cost and evaluation were the most difficult to obtain. Never did the kinds of data obtainable in each support any meaningful analysis of cost effectiveness. Cost information was almost never available in terms of program components, and sometimes not even in terms of distribution over major areas of expense. Usually a rough per pupil cost was available, and enough of a breakdown in overall figures to allow an estimate of the cost to replicate the program.

Considerable difficulty was encountered in obtaining the most recent evaluation results, and in some cases the promised data never materialized in repeated follow-ups. It seemed that evaluation of programs funded by local school districts or by federal or state agencies was not given high priority. Many so-called evaluation reports merely showed that pupils, teachers, principals, parents, and "distinguished visitors" liked the program, believed it to be successful, and thought that it could be replicated. These reports in turn were used as support for requests for further funding, regardless of the fact that the reports could seldom show hard data that the program in fact was successful.

Program Descriptions

Two separate publications were prepared on each program: a 10-20 page report describing the program in detail; a four-column summary brochure, or handout, of approximately 450 words.

The format for the Model Programs -- Early Childhood Education, established in consultation with the Office of Education, was not uniform for all programs. No standard headings were used. The reports were organized for interest and readability rather than for comparison or assessment of program components. Although they covered the context, description, and results of the programs, the organization of these was tailored to presenting the particular program most effectively for the non-specialist reader since many of the participants in the White House Conferences were lay persons. No formal evaluation was made, and only general costs were given. A semi-journalistic narrative style was employed.

The final manuscripts were edited by the Office of Education. Camera-ready copy was prepared in 8 1/4" x 5 1/2" one-column pages with side headings for printing by the Government Printing Office.

Audio-visual Documentation

Ten-minute slide-tape presentations were prepared on 12 programs (see Appendix C) for use at both the national and regional White House Conferences.

For programs selected for audio-visual documentation, arrangements were made for a second site visit. Two staff members with extensive photography experience did the on-site photography, using a rough script outline. The original site visitor and writer of the descriptive report on each program developed the script outline in consultation with the photographer, making suggestions for pictures that would best convey the program's unique qualities. At the site, several rolls of film were shot on the basis of the script guidelines and the photographer's on-the-spot judgment. A tape recorder was also used to record parts of the program activities for possible inclusion in the tape narrative.

From the developed slides, approximately 50 color slides were chosen and a final script written by staff members. The original script outline went through several adaptations and changes in organization and emphasis in the course of attaining the best combination of pictures and narrative coverage of the program content.

When the final script was prepared, it was annotated for timing of the pictures and narrative, and a professional narrator was employed to tape the script in a sound studio. When used, the "live sound" from the tape recorded at the site was integrated into the script narration. Sound synchronizing signals were added to the tape for automatic projection.

For each of the 12 programs, the original slides and tape and 10 copies were delivered to the Office of Education, along with copies of the scripts and technical instructions. The slides were delivered in Kodak carousels ready for fully automatic projection using a Kodak carousal projector and a stereo tape recorder with sound synchronizer attachment.

Chapter III

EXEMPLARY READING PROGRAMS

This phase of the project involved the field assessment of selected programs relating to reading instruction and the verification of their effectiveness as demonstration sites for visits by personnel from other school districts.

Selection of Programs

At the initial meeting between AIR Project Leaders and Office of Education personnel in Washington, D.C., April 28-29, 1970, AIR was provided with a list of 45 federally-supported projects which had reading as a component. This list had been compiled by the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education from nominations by state administrators and Follow Through sponsors. The recommendations were based on geographical distribution, representative educational settings and types of innovation, and evidence of success. Some of the variables considered by BESE in these selection criteria were:

1. USOE region
2. Source of Federal support (ESEA title, Follow Through, etc.)
3. Number of project participants
4. Community served (urban, rural, suburban, mixed)
5. Socioeconomic status (disadvantaged, middle class, etc.)
6. School level (elementary, secondary, mixed)
7. Program focus (reading only or reading as a component of a more comprehensive program design)
8. Evaluation (objective measures, subjective evidence, etc.)

The 45 programs were screened by the project staff in telephone interviews to elicit further information and request copies of available written documentation. These interviews were structured in terms of the following broad assessment criteria for adequate program descriptions:

1. Quality of the program, as reflected in improvements in reading by the participating students.
2. Replicability (cost data, types of settings, etc., which make it possible to adopt or adapt the program in other settings).
3. Geographical spread (programs nominated as potential visitation sites for other educators should be spread among the contiguous states).
4. Variability in setting and target population (exemplary programs should be identified for such varying settings as inner city, small rural, etc., and for differing populations, such as early childhood, secondary remedial, etc.).
5. Accessibility (in ranking potential visitation sites, consideration should be given to transportation and housing facilities, etc.).

It was also determined that efforts would be made to determine the degree to which operators of the program were amenable to having other educators visit.

As a result of the initial telephone contact or examination of documentation supplied by the programs, 10 of the 45 were dropped from further consideration. Five of them were either no longer in operation or did not expect to continue beyond the current school year. The reading components of the remaining four were judged to be inappropriate for the purposes of the study.

The remaining 33 programs recommended by BESE were site visited. While some of these were judged as borderline cases for inclusion in the study, it proved possible to visit them in the course of travel to other sites at small additional cost. Eleven of these were discovered to be unsuitable for consideration as exemplary visitation sites at this time, and it was agreed with OE that descriptive reports would not be prepared. There were a variety of reasons. In the interim between initial contact and the actual site visit, the funding of some of the programs had become uncertain or actually discontinued. In other cases, the on-site interviews brought out problems of reorganization, major changes in scope, or lack of results. The treatment of each of the 45 originally recommended reading programs is reported in Appendix D.

In consultation with OE and by means of literature searches and staff contacts, efforts were made to add to the programs remaining from the original BESE list. On the recommendation of OE, five Adult Basic Education programs were included. (See Appendix E). After investigation of approximately 20 alternatives, another six programs were selected by the project staff, with OE approval. (See Appendix F). Selection criteria included the attempt to bring in non-government-funded programs and to provide further representation of different types of innovation in the field of reading.

Table I reports the actions taken on the foregoing reading programs and how many were published in the Reading or Childhood Education series.

Site Visit Preparations and Procedures

The site visit strategy for the exemplary reading programs was essentially the same as for the childhood education programs. In each instance as much information as possible was collected about the program before site visiting.

A special inventory form for data collection was developed to meet the needs of the reading programs. This inventory form is reported in Appendix E. The major categories under which descriptive data were collected for each program were:

- Program Identification
- Cost of Program
- Community Factors
- School District Characteristics
- Characteristics of Schools in the Program
- Major Types of Personnel Involved in the Program
- Personnel in the Program
- Pupil Characteristics
- Learner Activities and Methodology
- Materials and Equipment
- Measurement and Evaluation

TABLE I

Summary of Disposition of Programs in Reading
for Inclusion in this Study

Identified by	No. Programs	Rejected Prior to Site Visit	Site Visited	Rejected Based on Site Visit	Description Submitted	Leaflet Submitted	Published by USOE Reading Series	Published by USOE Childhood Ed. Series
BESE	45	13	32	9	23	23	9	6
Division of Adult Education	5	0	5	0	5	5	0	0
AIR	6	0	6	0	6	6	1	1
TOTAL	56	13	43	9	37	37	10	7

- Testing Results
- Historical Development
- Supervisory and Instructional Practices

Program Descriptions

A common format for the descriptive reports was established in consultation with the Office of Education. This format followed closely the outline in the author's guide developed in previous AIR studies of exemplary programs.* Two separate publications were prepared on each program: a 20-30 page report treating in detail the program aims, content, and results; a four-column summary brochure, or handout, of approximately 450 words.

The descriptions were organized under five main headings, as explained below:

Introduction
Context of Program
Program Description
Evaluation
For Further Information

Introduction. At OE's request, the introduction was limited to a very brief statement of the program's focus and extent, amounting to less than a summary.

Context of Program. A description of the program's context is important as background for comparison and determining relevance for possible adoption in other educational settings. Included were demographic patterns of the locale; organization and characteristics of the school system, such as number of schools and students and per pupil costs; and needs assessment or historical development related to the program's inception and acceptance.

---

* Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., and Trickett, P. K. Preparing evaluation reports: A guide for authors. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

Program Description. This is a comprehensive discussion of the program's scope, components, and operating procedures -- how does it work? The following were some of the aspects covered:

- The program's specified objectives
- Participants and their characteristics, including any control groups
- Professional and other staff (selection, qualifications, duties)
- The time span, physical arrangements, classroom environment
- Inservice training and day-to-day evaluation
- Methods and activities (pupil groupings, learning activities, performance review, motivation)
- Instructional equipment and materials
- Parent-community involvement
- Costs.

Evaluation. Here evidence was presented on the extent to which the program met its objectives. Included were the definition of the sample, the evaluation design, the measures used, results, and interpretations.

For Further Information. A summary of information sources for prospective visitors is given, along with brief recommendations for travel arrangements and accommodations. Included are one or more names and addresses of program personnel to be contacted and available publications giving further details on the program.

A separate Bibliography section was included at the end of the report only if significant sources were not covered in the For Further Information section.

The reports were produced in two stages. First, staff writers and editors prepared a final manuscript from the draft reports of the site visits. The manuscripts were then mailed to Washington, where they were edited for both content and style by the Office of Education, and returned. In the second stage, camera-ready copy was prepared from the edited manuscripts for printing by the Government Printing Office.

Classification of Reading Programs

Of the 56 reading programs investigated, the descriptive reports of 10 were selected for publication by the United States Government Printing Office. Reports for seven other reading programs were published in the Childhood Education Series. Table II classifies the 10 selected reading programs with respect to program characteristics. (Two costs are given for the Topeka, Kansas, program. The clinic cost is much higher than the reading program cost.)

TABLE II

Ten Exemplary Reading Programs Classified

with Respect to Program Characteristics

	Intensive Reading Instruction Teams Hartford, Connecticut	Junior High School New York, New York	Summer Remedial and Enrichment Program Thomasville, Georgia	Programed Tutorial Reading Project Indianapolis, Indiana	Bloom Township High School Reading Program Chicago Heights, Illinois	Elementary Reading Center Milwaukee, Wisconsin	School-Within-a-School Keokuk, Iowa	The Topeka Reading Clinic, Centers, and Services Topeka, Kansas	Remedial Reading Pojoaque, New Mexico	Yuba County Reading-Learning Center Marysville, California
PROJECT PARTICIPATION										
0-100			x						x	
100-500	x						x			
Over 500		x		x	x	x		x		x
GRADE LEVEL										
K-3	x		x	x		x			x	x
4-6			x			x		x	x	x
7-9		x			x	x	x	x		x
10-12					x					
COST/STUDENT (Dollars)										
100-150		x	x						x	
150-200				x	x					
200-250						x	x	x		
Over 250	x							x		x
LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Hours/Day)										
Up to 1				x		x			x	
1-2		x						x		x
2-3	x									
Over 3			x				x			
Varies					x					
Continuous Program				x	x	x		x	x	x
Definite Period of Time	x	x	x		x		x			
DURATION OF PROJECT (Yrs.)										
0-2							x			
2-4			x							
Over 4	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
TYPE INSTRUCTION										
Individual	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x
Group 2-7	x	x				x	x	x	x	x
Group 8-Over	x	x	x		x		x	x		
PROGRAM IN SESSION										
Fall-Spring	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Summer		x	x							
IN-SERVICE TRAINING										
Orientational		x	x				x			
Special	x			x	x	x				x
Continuous	x		x	x		x		x		x
None									x	
USE OF PARA-PROFESSIONALS										
Teach				x						
Assist Teachers			x		x		x		x	x
Clerical	x						x			x
None		x				x		x		

Chapter IV

RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR SITE VISITS

The failure of many institutions to adopt new practices or innovative programs is no doubt attibutable to a vast number of reasons. However, one can speculate that school personnel in decision making capacities are frequently unaware of the nature or even the existence of institutions where such practices and programs are being implemented. Procedures are needed not only to inform educators about the existence of exemplary programs, but also to provide means by which visits can be made which will both maximize information dissemination and minimize the cost and burden on site personnel and visitors. Site visits to exemplary programs seems a most appropriate way to demonstrate how a program in a school is actually operated. Printed descriptions may identify programs, but they cannot convey as well as a site visit how the program is operated with children in the classroom.

Site visits, however, may not be profitable unless adequate preparation is made in advance. Without advance preparation one may visit a program, be impressed by it, but gain only vague ideas as to how it operates or how it may be initiated in another school.

The following discussion sets forth criteria and considerations oriented for typical field personnel usage. Strong emphasis is placed upon pre-visit preparation in order to enhance the effectiveness of on-site observation. Since one of the main purposes of educators and related school personnel visiting a program is that of replicating it, attention must be given to the feasibility of implementing the program in their own locality. Important for this are cost factors and attendant staff and plant modifications. Site visits should provide educators with needed information about exemplary programs which will facilitate informed introduction of such programs in new settings.

Selection of a Program to be Visited

With his own educational needs in mind, the prospective site visitor should locate and thoughtfully consider the answers to the following questions to determine whether or not it would be worthwhile for him to visit a particular program. Sources of information to assist him in locating the answers include: the narrative in each of the USOE reports, the references cited in the bibliographies of these reports; and the individuals cited in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION section of the reports. State and regional educational agencies and associations are often helpful.

- Where is the program located?
- What are the characteristics of the population served?
- In response to what needs was the program begun? How were these needs identified?
- What are the stated goals and/or objectives of the program? Are they both important and measurable? What evidence is there that the program is meeting its goals and objectives?
- What criteria, research design, measures and statistical procedures have been used to evaluate the program? What have been the results?
- What costs were involved in initiating the program (e.g., facilities, property, buses, equipment, materials, inservice training, consultant fees)?
- What was the initial cost to the school district? In what year? For how many pupils? For what period of time? Assuming that the comprehensiveness of the current program is the same as that for the initial one, what is the cost to sustain the program?
- What indirect costs are involved?

- Are or were any potential costs covered by in-kind services?

- What is the per-pupil cost? Based on which of the above costs?

- Do the results indicated in the evaluations justify the costs?

- Could the costs be reduced without jeopardizing any of the good results? If so, how?

- Might the program be worth visiting, regardless of the results and/or costs indicated, for reasons not here anticipated?

If the answers to the above questions satisfy the prospective visitor to the extent that he expects to continue with plans to make a site visit, we suggest that he follow the procedures outlined in the next three sections.

Preparation Beforehand

In preparation for the visit the prospective interviewer should:

- Obtain all available documents and audio-visual materials describing the project. Requests should be made by mail or phone.

- Review these documents thoroughly.

- Formulate the questions he wishes to ask at the site and develop a manageable instrument to use for obtaining and recording answers. (Suggestions as to how to do this appear later).

- Find out if there are any special program policies regarding visitors and, if so, what they are.

- Determine how much time he will need to obtain the answers to his questions and how much time the project personnel are able and willing to make available.

- Make arrangements for the visit. In doing so, he may wish to ask project personnel for suggestions regarding available transportation or living accommodations near the site.

- Develop a "strategy" for interviewing in order to: cover the most ground in the least amount of time; confirm information provided in the previously reviewed documents; avoid duplication of effort and contradiction if there are two or more interviewers; validate answers if there are two or more interviewees; obtain the needed information from the most knowledgeable personnel, since in most cases some personnel will be better able to address themselves to certain parts of a questionnaire than to others.

- If planning to use a tape recorder during an interview, practice with it beforehand. It is best to have one person at a time speak directly into the mike, but with the interviewer holding the mike and operating the switch. One other possibility is to have the interviewer ask each question into the mike; turn the mike off and listen to the answer; and then, turning the mike back on, paraphrase the answer. Both of these methods prevent waste of tape.

Procedures to be Followed at the Site

After introductions have been made and a certain rapport has been established, the interviewer should proceed as rapidly as possible through the interview to its conclusion. In order to do this, he should follow the procedures suggested below to avoid some undesirable situations which might otherwise arise.

- Summarize for the interviewee the topics to be covered during the interview and ask to speak to the most knowledgeable personnel for each.

- Pace the interview to conclude it in the time anticipated; allow specific amounts of time for each section.

- Ask the most important questions during the earliest part of the interview.

- Be most tactful when inquiring about the budget and evaluation, but don't be dissuaded.

- Keep control of the situation; don't allow the interviewee to stray too far from the point. One technique for doing this could be to politely interrupt him by restating the question, perhaps a little differently, and summarizing his previous remarks.

- Write answers on the form in complete sentences, not in phrases which later might prove to be unintelligible or ambiguous. This takes time but is well worth it.

- Don't write answers in spaces where they do not belong; if in a conversation about one issue the interviewee happens to answer a question which appears later in the questionnaire, the answer could be written on scrap paper or a blank facing page in the form with a reference to the section in which it belongs. Alternatively, it might be possible to briefly switch to the section being discussed if it is relatively easy to return to the place which was left.

- Be prepared to avoid an awkward situation at lunchtime by making specific arrangements, preferably ahead of time, about whether the interviewer(s) and interviewee(s) will lunch together and, if so, who will go and who will pay. If the interview is to continue after lunch, take a real break -- discuss something else at lunch -- and come back refreshed.

- Keep a running list of documents or information which the interviewee has promised to locate later, so that he can be reminded, should he forget.

- Don't linger beyond the agreed-upon time allotted for the visit.

- If two or more interviewers visit the site together, they should agree beforehand what the responsibilities of each will be and heed the agreement, making every effort to avoid contradictions and duplication of effort.

Preparation of the Interview Instrument

The interview instrument should be manageable; that is, the form should be as short and as flexible to use as possible. Items should be arranged by topic -- with the most important first. Sufficient space should be provided between items to write answers in complete sentences. The document should be bound in booklet form with the backs of pages left blank. For easy referencing, the pages should be numbered and labeled in one corner with the topic heading covered on that page; and there should be a table of contents.

The outline of topics to be covered in the interview might be any suitable variation of the following (all topics for which information was found during the initial review of documents prior to the site visit can conceivably be deleted from this outline; e.g., needs, objectives, budget, evaluation):

I. Context in which the program operates

II. Description of the program
   - A. Scope of the program; objectives
   - B. Personnel involved; responsibilities; training
   - C. Procedures followed
   - D. Materials used
   - E. Involvement of parents
   - F. Budget

III. Evaluation of the program
   - A. Objectives
   - B. Procedures
   - C. Findings
   - D. Conclusions and recommendations.

If the interviewer obtained from his earlier review of documents all the information he wanted to know about the population served, needs, objectives, evaluation, and budget, he can proceed through the interview in the order indicated above after confirming the important points in the sections just cited. If not, however, he would do best to obtain this information first, before asking about the other details.

The following is a list of questions, by topic, which could appear on the interview instrument. The interviewer should feel free to add or delete any sections he wishes depending upon his needs. (Again, those questions for which answers are already known based on a previous review of documents can be omitted here.)

I. Context

- In response to what needs was the program begun? Include needs of the community and school system, as well as the school population when appropriate.
- How were these needs identified?
- In what ways has the program been changed? In response to what needs?

II. Description of the Program

Scope

- How many students are in the program? What are their grade levels/what is the age range?
- How are students selected for the program?
- What are the specific objectives of the program? How do these reflect the needs cited earlier?

Personnel

- What kinds and numbers of personnel are included in the program? What part of their time is spent working on the program?

- How are personnel selected?

- What are their responsibilities? What amount of time is spent on each?

- What kinds of perservice and inservice training are required for program personnel; e.g., workshops, special courses? What length of time is involved?

- What content is covered by the training?

- What expenses are involved?

Facilities

- Where do program activities take place?

- What special physical arrangements were necessary to implement the program?

Activities

- What are the main learner activities in the program?

- How are they related to the program's objectives?

- What is a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for students?

- How are students grouped for activities?

- What is the average ratio of students to teachers and/or aides?

- How is the students' work evaluated?

- How long do students remain in the program?

Materials and Equipment

- What general/specific materials and equipment are essential to the program?

Parent-Community Involvement

- What is the relation of parents or the community to the program? How is this significant to the program?

Budget

- What is the total cost of the program for a given period of time? What is the cost per student?
- Where do the funds come from? What were the stipulations for use of the funds? How did the school system qualify to receive them?
- What costs were involved in initiating the program; e.g., facilities, materials, equipment, training, consultant fees?
- What costs are involved in sustaining the program; e.g., salaries, evaluation, maintenance of facilities, materials, and equipment?
- What indirect costs are involved? Are any potential costs covered by volunteered facilities or services?
- Could the costs be reduced without jeopardizing the results? If so, how?
- How can one obtain more detailed budget information?

III. Evaluation of the Program

- What research design or model was used for the evaluation; e.g., use of matched groups, or comparative growth over a given time period?
- Upon what program objectives was the evaluation based? What criteria were specified?
- On what portion of the program group was the evaluation made and how were students in the group selected? Control group?

- What instruments and procedures were used to measure each objective and how were these selected?
- What methods were employed to reduce and analyze the data? Why?
- What were the findings of the formal testing program? What were the conclusions and recommendations?
- What person or group was responsible for testing and evaluation and how were they qualified?

One very important question to ask concerns future plans of the school with respect to the program. The following are appropriate questions:

- What is the key to the program's success -- or the reason for its failure?
- What instructional practices seem to have contributed most to the program?
- What program features might successfully be implemented elsewhere?
- What things would program personnel do differently if they were starting the program again?
- What changes in the program are planned for the future?
- What changes are desired or needed but considered too costly or impractical at this time?

Chapter V

SUMMARY

Altogether, site visits were made to a total of 77 programs: 43 reading and 34 childhood education. From these visits 154 different documents were prepared for publication and dissemination and delivered to the Office of Education. Program descriptions and leaflets were prepared for 37 reading programs. Program descriptions and leaflets were prepared for 34 childhood education programs. Audio-visual documentation was prepared for 12 childhood education programs.

Looking back from the vantage point of accumulated experience there are aspects of the programs studied that stand out and call for comment, much of it favorable, and some that prompts suggestions with positive intentions.

One is impressed by the wide and varied differences among the programs. While the reading programs were all targeted toward teaching youngsters to read, each program had in some way a unique approach. In fact, uniqueness may be a major factor in contributing to the success of the program.

The importance of seeing a program in action cannot be overstressed. No report, no matter how pleasant and well-written, can substitute for the direct observation of the reactions of teachers and youngsters in the program. Interested teachers and students make any program operate better.

Programs varied greatly in their use of objectives. In some cases the objectives were clearly stated but the activities of the youngsters in the classroom were not related to the objectives. In the better programs the objectives of the program were used as guides for the operation and evaluation of the program.

Evaluation constituted a problem for most programs. Hardly a program was free from blemishes of sampling, design, testing, data recording, or interpretation. Many programs contained no hard evaluative data that indicated that the program clearly made a difference. In others, standardized

and other tests not clearly related to the objectives of the program were used for evaluation. A typical evaluation design was to administer a test in the Fall and readminister it in the Spring. The program was termed successful if the Spring results were higher than the Fall results. No comparison was made with control or students in "regular" programs, nor were the differences reflected against norms or expected growth scales.

Cost data were most difficult to assemble. It was difficult to differentiate between general school expenditures and expenditures specific to a program. Great variation existed between the programs due to such factors as variations in teacher salaries for various sections of the country. It is probably more effective to cost a program in personnel and instructional materials needs than in actual dollar value. In any case, our efforts to collect cost data suggested that the field of cost-effectiveness analysis in education is scarcely explored.

The history of a program is important in understanding a program. In history one can identify problems that had to be overcome in order to operate the program successfully. Observation of the current program may not identify the problems that had to be overcome. While such was not important in preparing the descriptive documents, it appears quite important to school people who are interested in replicating a program. Hence, on site visits by school people the visitors' guide recommends identification of problems that need to be overcome in starting up a new program.

Evaluation of this project cannot be made in terms of the 77 programs site visited and documented. It is doubtful if this project had any effect upon the programs visited, either for the better or the worse. This project will have made a contribution if through the documents developed the staff of a school somewhere looks to new and innovative programs that can be initiated for the purpose of improving the quality of educational opportunities for its students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ammerman, H. L., Clukey, D., & Thomas, G. P. (Eds.). Profiles of exemplary projects in educational RDD&E, part three. pp. 1269-1342. Monmouth, Oregon: Teaching Research, 1972.

Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, 1968.

Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., DeWitt, K. M., & Trickett, P. K. A study of further selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, 1969.

Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., & Trickett, P. K. Preparing evaluation reports: A guide for authors. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Thirty-Four Model Programs in Childhood Education for Which Descriptive Brochures Were Published by United States Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity

"Neighborhood House Child Care Services"
Seattle, Washington

9415 18th Avenue, S.W.
Seattle, Washington 98106
(Mrs. Margaret Sanstad, Director)

Seattle's answer to child care problems of low-income families.

Site visited by AIR: 21 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 23 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Neighborhood House Child Care Services, Seattle, Washington. 1970. 18 p. HE 5.220:20130. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Neighborhood House Child Care Services, Seattle, Washington. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20130-1.

* * *

"NRO Migrant Child Development Centers"
Pasco, Washington

Northwest Rural Opportunities
110 N. Second Street
Pasco, Washington 99302
(Mrs. Louise Gustafson, Child Development Specialist)

Rural day care centers for pre-school children of migrant farm workers.

Site visited by AIR: 25 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 2 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
NRO [Northwest rural opportunities] Migrant Child Development Centers, Pasco, Washington. 1970. 16 p. HE 5.220:20133. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 27 October 1970.
NRO [Northwest rural opportunities] Migrant Child Development Centers, Pasco, Washington. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220-20133-1.

"Tacoma Public Schools Early Childhood Program"
Tacoma, Washington

P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, Washington 98401
(Mr. James Robertson)

Combined local, state, and federal funds to support a large-scale early childhood program in the public schools.

Site visited by AIR: 24 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Tacoma Public Schools Early Childhood Program, Tacoma, Washington. 1970. 14 p. HE 5.220:20160. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Tacoma Public Schools Early Childhood Program, Tacoma, Washington. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20160-1.

* * *

"Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction"
Salt Lake City, Utah

2870 Connor Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
(Dr. Ethna Reid, Director)

A cooperative venture in reading research and training reaches a nationwide audience.

Site visited by AIR: 15 July 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 26 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1970. 16 p. HE 5.220:20136. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction, Salt Lake City, Utah. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20136-1.

"Behavior Analysis Model of a Follow Through Program"
Oraibi, Arizona

Hopi Action Council
Box 178
Oraibi, Arizona 86039
(Miss Peggy Taylor)

A Hopi Indian community-selected Follow Through program with individualized instruction, concrete incentives, and parent aides.

Site visited by AIR: 10 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 23 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Behavior Analysis Model of a Follow Through Program, Oraibi, Arizona. 1970. 19 p. HE 5.220:20131. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 8 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Behavior Analysis Model of a Follow Through Program, Oraibi, Arizona. [folder] [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20131-1.

* * *

"Cross-Cultural Family Center"
San Francisco, California

San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California 94132
(Dr. Mary B. Lane)

A nursery school providing a multi-cultural curriculum to promote racial understanding and acceptance.

Site visited by AIR: 1 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 28 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Cross Cultural Family Center, San Francisco, California. 1970. 12 p. HE 5.220:20132. 15¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Cross-Cultural Family Center, San Francisco, California. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20132-1.

"Cognitively Oriented Curriculum"
Ypsilanti, Michigan

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
125 North Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(Dr. David P. Weikart)

A program that exposes preschool children to a variety of materials and equipment to teach concepts through physical and verbal experiences.

Site visited by AIR: 7 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 3 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, Ypsilanti, Michigan. 1970. 24 p.
HE 5.220:20145. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 10 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, Ypsilanti, Michigan. [folder]. [1970].
[6 p.] HE5.220:20145-1.

* * *

"Martin Luther King Family Center"
Chicago, Illinois

124 North Hoyne Avenue, Apt. 113
Chicago, Illinois 60612
(Mr. Manuel L. Jackson, Executive Director)

A community-controlled agency offering educational, psychological, and cultural services to the black community.

Site visited by AIR: 22 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 10 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Martin Luther King Family Center, Chicago, Illinois. 1970. 15 p.
HE 5.220:20154. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Martin Luther King Family Center, Chicago, Illinois. [folder]. [1970].
[6] p. HE 5.220:20154-1.

"Mothers' Training Program"
Urbana, Illinois

Institute for Research on Exceptional Children
4th and Healy
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(Dr. Merle B. Karnes)

Training mothers in disadvantaged areas to teach their own children at an early age results in new attitudes for mothers, educational gains for children.

Site visited by AIR: 9 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Mothers' Training Program, Urbana, Illinois. 1970. 19 p.
HE 5.220:20147. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 2 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Mothers' Training Program, Urbana, Illinois. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p.
HE 5.220:20147-1.

* * *

"Behavior Principles Structural Model of a Follow Through Program"
Dayton, Ohio

4208 N. Western Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45427
(Mrs. Wiletta Weatherford, Director of Follow Through)

A Follow Through program designed to help disadvantaged children learn basic skills quickly by using programmed materials and continuing teacher reinforcement.

Site visited by AIR: 24 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 11 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Behavior Principles Structural Model of a Follow Through Program, Dayton, Ohio. 1970. 11 p. HE 5.220:20155. 15¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Behavior Principles Structural Model of a Follow Through Program, Dayton, Ohio. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20155-1.

"The Day Nursery Association of Cleveland"
Cleveland, Ohio

2084 Cornell Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

A long history of care for children, involvment of parents, and service to the community.

Site visited by AIR: 9 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 23 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Day Nursery Association of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio. 1970. 18 p.
HE 5.220:20146. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Day Nursery Association of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p. HE 5.220:20146-1.

* * *

"Corrective Reading Program"
Wichita, Kansas

Division of Curriculum Services
Wichita Public Schools
Community Education Center
1847 N. Chautauqua
Wichita, Kansas 67214
(Dr. James Howell, Director of Reading)

A special program designed to improve the reading grade level, vocabulary, comprehension, and self-concept of disadvantaged youths.

Site visited by AIR: 26 May 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Corrective Reading Program, Wichita, Kansas. 1970. 15 p.
HE 5.220:20158. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Corrective Reading Program, Wichita, Kansas. [folder]. [1970]. [6] p.
HE 5.220:20158-1.

"Bilingual Early Childhood Program"
San Antonio, Texas

Early Childhood Program
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Commodore Perry Hotel, Suite 550
Austin, Texas 78701
(Mrs. Shari Nedler, Program Director)

A program designed to meet the language and other needs of Spanish-speaking Mexican-American children ages 3 to 5.

Site visited by AIR: 8 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 11 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Bilingual Early Childhood Program, San Antonio, Texas. 1970. 17 p.
HE 5.220:20134. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Bilingual Early Childhood Program, San Antonio, Texas. [folder]. [1970].
[6] p. HE 5.220:20134-1.

* * *

"Santa Monica Children's Centers"
Santa Monica, California

Lincoln Child Development Center
1532 California Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90403
(Mrs. Docia Zavitovsky, Director)

Low-cost cay care facilities for children of working mothers made available through the cooperation of the California State government and local school districts.

Site visited by AIR: 16 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 27 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Santa Monica Children's Centers, Santa Monica, California. 1970. 17 p.
HE 5.220:20135. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Santa Monica Children's Centers, Santa Monica, California. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20135-1.

"Dubnoff School for Educational Therapy"
North Hollywood, California

10526 Victory Place
North Hollywood, California 91606

A center for work with educationally handicapped children.

Site visited by AIR: 17 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 27 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Dubnoff School for Educational Therapy, North Hollywood, California.
1970. 18 p. HE 5.220:20137. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 26 October 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Dubnoff School for Educational Therapy, North Hollywood, California.
[folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20137-1.

* * *

"University of Hawaii Preschool Language Curriculum"
Honolulu, Hawaii

Center for Research in Early Childhood Education
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
(Mrs. Dorothy C. Adkins)

A program of English conversation for preschool children of multi-ethnic backgrounds.

Site visited by AIR: 26 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
University of Hawaii Preschool Language Curriculum, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1970. 20 p. HE 5.220:20156. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
University of Hawaii Preschool Language Curriculum, Honolulu, Hawaii.
[folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20156-1.

"Police Youth Protection Unit Programs"
San Jose, California

Youth Protection Unit
San Jose Police Department
P.O. Box 270
San Jose, California 95103
(Sergeant James Guido, Supervisor)

Dedicated police officers and a concerned community reach younger citizens.

Site visited by AIR: 15 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Police Youth Protection Unit Programs, San Jose, California. 1970.
19 p. HE 5.220:20151. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Police Youth Protection Unit Programs, San Jose, California. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20151-1.

* * *

"Community Cooperative Nursery School"
Menlo Park, California

Community Cooperative Nursery School
Laurel and Ravenswood
Menlo Park, California 94025
(Mrs. Frances Oliver, President)

A preschool program involving mothers as organizers, helpers, and decision-makers.

Site visited by AIR: 15 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 10 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Community Cooperative Nursery School, Menlo Park, California. 1970.
11 p. HE 5.220:20161. 15¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Community Cooperative Nursery School, Menlo Park, California. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20161-1.

"New Schools Exchange"
Santa Barbara, California

New Schools Exchange
301 East Canon Perdido
Santa Barbara, California
(Mr. Harvey Haber)

A central clearing house for information about new schools that publishes a directory of new, innovative schools and offers assistance to new schools.

Site visited by AIR: 27 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 30 November 1970.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 30 November 1970.

Not selected for publication in Childhood Education series.

* * *

"Demonstration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers"
Greensboro, North Carolina

Infant Care Project
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
(Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister)

A model day care center for children under 3 years old.

Site visited by AIR: 30 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Demonstration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers, Greensboro, North Carolina. 1970. 15 p. HE 5.220:20138. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 November 1970
Distributed by Office of Education.
Demonstration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers, Greensboro, North Carolina. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20138-1.

"Responsive Environment Model of a Follow Through Program"
Goldsboro, North Carolina

Follow Through Program
Box 1797
Goldsboro, North Carolina
(Mrs. Doris Shaw, Director)

A classroom Environment which responds to children rather than one which requires them to respond to adults results in confident, capable children.

Site visited by AIR: 25 May 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Responsive Environment Model of a Follow Through Program, Goldsboro, North Carolina. 1970. 19 p. HE 5.220:20139. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 28 October 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Responsive Environment Model of a Follow Through Program, Goldsboro, North Carolina. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20139-1.

* * *

"Center for Early Development and Education"
Little Rock, Arkansas

Center for Early Development and Education
814 Sherman Street
Little Rock, Arkansas
(Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell, Director)

A fusion of a child development approach with a public school system in a program serving children from 6 months to 12 years of age.

Site visited by AIR: 28 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Center for Early Development and Education, Little Rock, Arkansas. 1970. 18 p. HE 5.220:20140. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 3 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Center for Early Development and Education, Little Rock, Arkansas. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20140-1.

"DOVACK"
Monticello, Florida

P.O. Box 499
Monticello, Florida 32344
(Mrs. Florine Way, Program Director)

A computer-assisted language experience which allows children to create their own reading lessons.

Site visited by AIR: 2 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

DOVACK [differentiated, oral, visual, aural, computerized, kinesthetic], Monticello, Florida. 1970. 17 p. HE 5.220:20141. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 15 October 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

DOVACK [differentiated, oral, visual, aural, computerized, kinesthetic], Monticello, Florida. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20141-1.

* * *

"Project PLAN"
Parkersburg, West Virginia

Wood County Schools
Parkersburg, West Virginia 26101
(Mr. Ernest Page, Jr., Assistant Superintendent for Instruction)

The need for individualized instruction is being met by an innovative educational system that focuses on major subject areas and encompasses all grade levels.

Site visited by AIR: 20 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 14 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Project PLAN, Parkersburg, West Virginia. 1970. 15 p. HE 5.220:20150. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Project PLAN, Parkersburg, West Virginia. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20150-1.

"Perceptual Development Center Program"
Natchez, Mississippi

Perceptual Development Center
108 South Commerce Street
Natchez, Mississippi 39120
(Mrs. H. Lee Jones, Jr., Director)

A program offering special methods and materials for children with reading disabilities.

Site visited by AIR: 2 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Perceptual Development Center Program, Natchez, Mississippi. 1970. 13 p. HE 5.220:20142. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 28 October 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Perceptual Development Center Program, Natchez, Mississippi. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20142-1.

* * *

"Appalachia Preschool Education Program"
Charleston, West Virginia

P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325
(Dr. Roy W. Alford)

A three-part preschool program combining a television program, paraprofessional home visitors, and a mobile classroom.

Site visited by AIR: 2 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 28 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.

Appalachia Preschool Education Program, Charleston, West Virginia. 1970. 13 p. HE 5.220:20143. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.

Appalachia Preschool Education Program, Charleston, West Virginia. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20143-1.

"Foster Grandparent Program"
Nashville, Tennessee

Grandparents for Children
Senior Citizens, Incorporated
Nashville, Tennessee 37202
(Miss Jean Akins, Director)

A program where lonely children can be "spoiled" by foster grandparents, who themselves benefit by the relationship.

Site visited by AIR: 5 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Foster Grandparent Program, Nashville, Tennessee. 1970. 12 p.
HE 5.220:20144. 15¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 30 October 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Foster Grandparent Program, Nashville, Tennessee. [folder]. [1970.]
[6] p. HE 5.220:20144-1.

* * *

"The Micro-Social Preschool Learning System"
Vineland, New Jersey

6 East 82nd Street
New York, New York 10028
(Dr. Myron Woolman)

A program for preschoolers from poor migrant families stresses development of language and behavioral skills and raises IQ's.

Site visited by AIR: 17 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 6 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Micro-Social Preschool Learning System, Vineland, New Jersey. 1970.
27 p. HE 5.220:20148. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Micro-Social Preschool Learning System, Vineland, New Jersey. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20148-1.

"Interdependent Learner Model of a Follow Through Program"
New York, New York

P.S. 76
220 West 121st Street
New York, New York 10027
(Miss Martha Sellers, Project Coordinator)

A program designed to raise reading achievement by encouraging children to learn interdependently and by emphasizing decoding skills.

Site visited by AIR: 24 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 October 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Interdependent Learner Model of a Follow Through Program, New York, N.Y. 1970. 13 p. HE 5.220:20149. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Interdependent Learner Model of a Follow Through Program, New York, N.Y. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20149-1.

* * *

"Hartford Early Childhood Program"
Hartford, Connecticut

Hartford Public Schools
249 High Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
(Mr. Joseph D. Randazzo)

An urban public school system's large-scale approach toward restructuring early childhood education.

Site visited by AIR: 21 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Hartford Early Childhood Program, Hartford, Connecticut. 1970. 13 p. HE 5.220:20162. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Hartford Early Childhood Program, Hartford, Connecticut. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20162-1.

"Model Observation Kindergarten and First Grade"
Amherst, Massachusetts

Marks Meadow School
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
(Mrs. Kathleen McKay, Director)

Model classrooms which offer completely individualized scheduling for mixed age groups of kindergarten and first-grade students.

Site visited by AIR: 19 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Model Observation Kindergarten and First Grade, Amherst, Massachusetts. 1970. 15 p. HE 5.220:20152. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Model Observation Kindergarten and First Grade, Amherst, Massachusetts. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20152-1.

* * *

"Boston Public Schools Learning Laboratories"
Boston, Massachusetts

Learning Laboratories Project
Warren Prescott School
Charlestown, Massachusetts 02129
(Dr. Thomas Gordon, Director)

A special approach for slow learners and gifted students in grades two through four.

Site visited by AIR: 16 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 9 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Boston Public Schools Learning Laboratories, Boston, Massachusetts. 1970. 15 p. HE 5.220:20153. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Boston Public Schools Learning Laboratories, Boston, Massachusetts. [folder]. [1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20153-1.

"Springfield Avenue Community School"
Newark, New Jersey

Springfield Avenue Community School
447 18th Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07111
(Mr. James Baten, Educational Director)

A school whose curriculum emphasis is on the black "life-style"

Site visited by AIR: 24 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Springfield Avenue Community School, Newark, New Jersey. 1970. 14 p.
HE 5.220:20157. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Springfield Avenue Community School, Newark, New Jersey. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. HE 5.220:20157-1.

* * *

"Philadelphia Teacher Center"
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Durham School
16th and Lombard Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146
(Dr. Donald Rasmussen)

A staff development program which provides a place where teachers can make things for their classrooms and exchange ideas with others.

Site visited by AIR: 21 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 13 November 1970.
For sale by Superintent of Documents.
Philadelphia Teacher Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 1970. 12 p.
HE 5.220:20163. 15¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 November 1970.
Distributed by Office of Education.
Philadelphia Teacher Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. [folder].
[1970.] [6] p. He 5.220:20163-1.

APPENDIX B

Inventory Forms for Data Collected for
Childhood Education Programs
for White House Conference on Children and Youth

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

Interviewers: _____

_____

Date of visit: _____

Program Identification

1. What is the program title?

2. What are the names of the program director and his deputy? What are their phone numbers and addresses?

3. What is the program address?

4. Does the program work with a sponsor or an outside consultant?

5. Are there other sites based on the same model and sponsored by the same institution?

6. How long has the program been in operation?

7. Is the program expected to continue? If not, why not?

8. In which documents is the program described? Are these available to the public upon request? Price of document?

9. Is there audio-visual documentation of the program? Rental or fee? How can this be obtained for the White House Conferences? (See page 1 of Appendix.)

White House Conference
Project Title_____

Program Identification (continued)

10. Is there a guiding committee on a standing basis? Composition?

11. Is the program affiliated with a school district? Describe that relationship.

12. Whom should be contacted for further information, and what are their addresses?

13. If the program is continuing, through whom can visits be arranged?

14. Are there special considerations for program visitor policies, living accommodations, or transportation?

Historical Development and Objectives

15. What person or persons in the district were instrumental in creating the program? When?

16. Briefly describe the historical development of the program, including such things as major objectives (were they specifically stated and understood by all concerned?), the target population (what specific needs of this population were perceived and how and why were they perceived?), philosophy, etc.

17. What are the stated goals and objectives (specific or general, long-range or short-term, etc)?

18. Are there other unstated objectives of major importance?

19. Has criteria been established for what would be considered acceptable evidence of success?

White House Conference
Project Title _____

Community Factors

20. How would you describe the community served by the program groups?

	Socio-Economic %			
	Low	Medium	High	
a. Non-metropolitan	_____ % (up to $6,000)	_____ % ($6,000 to $13,000)	_____ % ($13,000 and up)	= 100%
or				
b. Metropolitan	_____ % (up to $6,500)	_____ % ($6,500 to $15,000)	_____ % (15,000 and up)	= 100%

21. What is an estimate of the average annual income of a family in the community?

22. Ethnic show%

_____	_____	_____	_____	= 100%
black	Spanish Surname	Other minority	white	

23. Is there a second language or strong dialect influence in the community? What specific problems does it present?

24. Most appropriate descriptions of the community and the citizenry (major occupational groups, transient or permanent, percentage on welfare, percentage unemployed, general political attitudes, physical characteristics of the town, etc.).

Personnel

25. (Refer to the chart on page 6 for the following questions.)

    a. What categories of personnel are involved?

    b. What are the typical qualifications for supervisory, instruction, and support personnel (academic background, state or local certifications, experience, etc.)?

    c. What are their primary duties?

    d. What were the selection procedures for personnel?

26. What are the characteristics possessed by instructional personnel?
    (language)

    (ethnic)

    (age)

    (sex)

    (other)

27. What in-service or special training is provided in the program? Is this or other training also provided to parents of children in the program? Describe (length, content, source, etc.).

28. Are parents involved in the program? How?

29. What is the personnel attrition rate? Why do they leave? Do many continue in education?

    Administrative:

    Instructional:

    Support:

White House Conference
Project Title: _____

Personnel (continued)

CATEGORIES	NUMBER	QUALIFICATIONS	DUTIES	HOW SELECTED	AVERAGE HOURS CONTACT/ WEEK
Administrative:					
Instructional:					
Support:					

Administrative:
District Administrator
School Administrator
Special Consultants
(include fees, location, etc.)
Curriculum Specialists
(target subject or supplementary subjects)

Instructional:
Certified teachers
Provisional teachers
Teacher-interns
Teacher aides (paid)
Teacher aides (volunteer)
Reading therapists

Support:
Counselors
Medical doctors
Social workers
School nurses
School psychologists
Speech therapists
Research Evaluators
Librarians
Library aides (paid)
Library aides (volunteer)
Secretaries
Clerical assistants
Other

Pupil Characteristics

30. What are the selection procedures for pupils?
Program? Control?

31. How many pupils are there?
Program? Control?

32. At what actual grade levels? How is this determined?
Program? Control?

33. What is the mean age and what is the range of ages?
Program? Control?

34. What is the male : female ratio?
Program? Control?

35. What is the proportion of pupils for whom English is a second language? What are the primary languages?
Program? Control?

Pupil Characteristics (continued)

36. What are the following percentages?

	Program	Control
What is the % black?		
What is the % Spanish surname?		
What is the % other minorities?		
What is the % white?		
What is the % of high income?		
What is the % of middle income?		
What is the % of low income.		

37. What is the physiological status of the students (physical handicaps if common to group)? How are the handicaps identitied?
Program? Control?

38. What is the emotional behavior of the students (disciplinary or other)? How is this determined?
Program? Control?

39. Are the students involved in other special programs? Describe.
Program? Control?

40. What % of the pupils have had pre-school or pre-program educational experience? Specify the kinds of experience.
Program? Control?

41. For the children who are involved in this program, what % are expected to participate in future programs?

Learner Activities and Methodology

42. What proportion of the time do learners spend in the following learning situations?

	Program	Control or Base
Individual		
Small groups (2-7)		
Medium groups (8-20)		
Large groups (21 and over)		

43. What is the typical teacher : student ratio?
Program? Control?

44. What is the typical teacher aide : student ratio?

45. What innovative technologies, if any, are employed for instructional or other purposes?
Program? Control?

46. Is there any centralized "learning center" in the program used by the students? Is it optional or specified?
Program? Control?

Learner Activities and Methodology (continued)

47. What innovative instructional practices have been developed or implemented successfully?
Program? Control?

48. What are the main activities?

49. Are provisions made for supplemental (tutorial) instruction outside the regular school program? Describe.

50. Are there differences in the reward system between program and control groups? What is the grading or evaluation system?

Learner Activities and Methodology (continued)

51. Are any of the following services provided to participants in the program? Describe.

    Food, health care, transportation, etc.

52. What are the important instructional materials used in the program? (Interviewer may refer to the chart on page 2 of the Appendix.)

Measurement and Evaluation

53. Were students randomly selected for treatment groups (if not answered in question 30)?

54. How were students selected for control groups (if not answered in question 30)?

55. What are the drop-out rates during the program?
Program? Control?

56. Why did students drop out? Were new students added? Did some students have poor attendance records? How were these factors dealt with in the evaluation?

57. What person or group was primarily responsible for testing and evaluation? Why?

58. What are the known differences, if any, in test administration procedures for the program and control pupils?

59. Who administered the tests and on what dates?

60. What tests (edition and form) were used, and with what results? (Interviewer may refer to the chart on page 3 of the Appendix.)

Measurement and Evaluation (continued)

61. Is data collected form parents, faculty, and students other than by test? What data, and how is it collected?

62. What are the most important findings of the formal testing program?

63. Are there results that you feel are not revealed in the formal testing program? Describe. Why do you feel they are not revealed?

64. What are the apparent changes in students' cognitive skills due to the involvement in the program?

65. What are changes in students' attitudes due to involvement in the program?

Measurement and Evaluation (continued)

66. What other impact has it had for the participants? Have other important changes in student behavior occured?

67. What are the attitudes of peers to students in this program? How was this determined?

68. Are there changes in students' educational aspirations due to involvement in the program? Describe. How was this determined?

School District and Building Characteristics

69. What is the organizational pattern of the schools in the area served by the program.

70. Is special state or local certification required to start a day care center? Describe.

71. What is the average teacher : pupil ratio for the district as a whole?

72. Have the actions of any community groups especially influenced the program (if not described in historical development)?

73. What is the cost per pupil in the school district as a whole?

74. Have any of the facilities been constructed or altered especially to accommodate the program? Describe.

75. The interviewer should describe the phusical site in as much detail as possible. (Make notes or take slides for future audio-visual documentation.)

White House Conference
Pfoject Title_____

School District and Building Characteristics (continued)

76. Is busing involved in the program? How?

Cost of the Program

77. What is the total cost of the program, and is that an annual figure?

78. What proportion of the funding is Federal?
State?
Local?
Other?

79. What costs would be involved in initiating the program (such as new buildings, property, buses, equipment, materials, in-service training, consultant fees, other)?

80. What costs would be involved in sustaining the program (replacement of equipment and materials, salaries, evaluation services, other)?

81. What is the per student cost comparison between program and control groups?

White House Conference
Project Title_____

Supervisory and Instructional Practices

82. What supervisory practices seem to have contributed most to the program?

83. What changes in supervisory practices will / might be undertaken to improve the program?

84. What instructional practices seem to have contributed most to the program?

85. What changes in instructional practices will / might be undertaken to improve the program?

86. What changes in overall program design, measurement, or other aspects will / would you implement?

87. What program feature (or features), in your opinion, might successfully be implemented elsewhere? Describe.

Supervisory and Instructional Practices (continued)

88. How will the program continue next year?

APPENDIX

	page
Audio-visual Instructions	21
Materials and Equipment	22
Testing Results	23

Audio-visual Instructions

Be certain to obtain complete information about available audio-visual documentation (film, filmstrip, video-tape, slides, other, running time, size, availability of prints).

Make photographs or slides of the facilities and of the activities to illustrate the distinctive features of the program for your report. These prints can later be used to help develop a script for a professional photographer who will make the final audio-visual documentation.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

Project Title _____

Name of material	Cost per unit	Ratio copies to pupils	Assoc. Equip. required	Appropriate Grade Level	Appropriate maturity level	Ethnic or language relevance	Source	Remark
Texts								
Kits								
A V media								
Locally prepared								
Other								

TESTING RESULTS Project Title _____

Measurement Instrument Name	Central tendency and Dispersion				Number students		Statistical technique used	Conclusions (sig. level if approp.)	Remarks (pre-post time interval, etc.)
	Pre-test		Post-test						
	Program	control	program	control	program	control			
Reading Achievement									
_____									
_____									
Self Concept									
_____									
_____									
Intelligence									
_____									
_____									
Personality									
_____									
_____									
Motor skills									
_____									
_____									
Local Diagnostic									
Other									

APPENDIX C

Twelve Childhood Education Programs Which Were Documented by Audio-Visual Presentations

(8-10 minutes of single frame color presentations integrated into a continuous audio-visual tape)

Behavior Analysis Model of a Follow Through Program
Oraibi, Arizona

Cross Cultural Family Center
San Francisco, California

Hartford Early Childhood Program
Hartford, Connecticut

University of Hawaii Preschool Language Curriculum
Honolulu, Hawaii

Corrective Reading Program
Wichita, Kansas

Day Nursery Association of Cleveland
Cleveland, Ohio

Philadelphia Teacher Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction
Salt Lake City, Utah

Neighborhood House Child Care Services
Seattle, Washington

Appalachia Preschool Education Program
Charleston, West Virginia

Project PLAN
Parkersburg, West Virginia

DOVAK
Monticello, Florida

APPENDIX D

Disposition of 45 Federally-Supported Reading Projects

Recommended by Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)

as Exemplary Reading Programs

REGION I

"Intensive Reading Instructional Teams," Title I, ESEA
Hartford Public Schools
249 High Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
(203) 527-4191
(Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood)

Site visited by AIR: 4 June 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, Hartford, Connecticut. 1971.
35 p. HE 5.230:30034 S/N 1780-0785. 25c.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION I

"Correction and Enrichment of Reading Skills," Title I, ESEA
Lynn Public Schools
Administration Building
Lynn, Massachusetts
(617) 599-9344
(Dr. Miriam M. Morse)

This project for disadvantaged children provided for remedial reading in small-group or individualized instruction, based on diagnostic testing and supported by conferences with parents. This project conducted four-week-long summer sessions in eight schools.

Site visited by AIR: 20 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in series.

REGION I

"Dartmouth Summer Reading Center," Title I, ESEA
Dartmouth Public Schools
366 Slocum Road
North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747
(617) 997-3391
(Dr. Richard L. Fiander)

This project utilized a team approach in small nongraded classrooms focused on diagnosis of elementary school children's reading disabilities, a developmental reading service, and the development of positive attitudes toward reading. Program is continuing without the support of federal funding.

Site visited by AIR: 22 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the series.

REGION II

"Newark Greater Cities Project," #67-50, ESEA, Title III
31 Green Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102
(201) 622-6700
(Mr. Watson)

The project investigated originally involved about 40 black elementary school children being transported to school in the suburbs and provided with enriched activities, including extra personnel and remedial reading. Newark school personnel suggested alternative programs within the school district. A specifically reading-oriented project could not be identified. Later the Springfield Avenue Community School was selected as a Model Program in the Childhood Education Series. Newark was dropped as a reading site.

* * *

REGION II

"After School Study Centers," Title I, ESEA
Division of Elementary Schools
Board of Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
(212) 596-6695
(Mrs. Truda T. Weil)

Investigation indicated that the administration of the After School Study Centers was transferred to the numerous school districts from central administration. Only a few of the districts had programs relating directly to reading. AIR was unable to obtain any quantitative data on the effects of this program on student achievement since its decentralization. Accordingly, the project was not site visited and was dropped from the list for the preparation of description reports.

REGION II

"Junior High Summer Institutes," Title I, ESEA
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
(212) 723-3999
(Dr. Bernard Fox)

Site visited by AIR: 17 June 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Summer Junior High Schools, New York, New York. 1971. 22 p. HE 5.230:30031
S/N 1780-0782. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION II

"Afternoon Remedial and Enrichment Program," Title I, ESEA
712 City Hall
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 842-4686
(Mr. Eugene Reville)

This project provided instruction to students on an individual or small group basis during after-school hours. Enriching experiences were also provided. During the summer a similar instructional program was conducted.

Site visited by AIR: 13 July 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in series.

REGION II

"Interdependent Learning Model," Follow Through
Institute for Developmental Studies
New York University
239 Green Street
New York, New York
(212) 598-2464
(Dr. Lassar G. Gotkin)

This project was designed to teach reading by emphasizing mastery of limited, specific materials in an empirically-arrived at sequence. The project was conducted with a small group of disadvantaged, black five-year olds. Similar instructional programs were carried out with children in Atlanta, Georgia and other locations in New York City.

Site visited by AIR: 16 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in Childhood Education Series. Separate description of reading program not selected for publication.

* * *

REGION II

"IMPETUS - STAY-IN." Title I, ESEA
School District of the City of Chester
Chester, Pennsylvania
(215) 876-3345
(Patrick Ahern)

This project included the use of the "Talking Typewriter" with a small number of elementary and junior high school students. The reading components of the project could not be specifically identified. It was decided not to site visit the project or prepare a descriptive report for this project as a model reading program.

REGION II

"Pilot-Operational Grant to Follow-up a Funded Planning Grant for the Neshaminy Reading Team Program," #67-3833, ESEA, Title III

Carl Sandburg Junior High School
Levittown, Pennsylvania 19056
(215) 757-6901
(Mrs. Clara D. Milner)

This program incorporated developmental reading instruction into the teaching of subject content. About 1,440 talented, average and handicapped children were involved over a three year period.

A letter from the superintendent of the Neshaminy School District informed us that as of June 24, 1970, no funds were available to continue the program for the school year 1970-71. The school was not site visited, and no descriptive report was prepared.

* * *

REGION II

"Nongraded Primary Unit," #67-3869, ESEA, Title III
Superintendent of Schools
Kenmawr Avenue
Rankin, Pennsylvania
(412) 271-2434
(M. J. Silverstein)

This project involved disadvantaged elementary school students in a non-graded primary unit based on a maximum class size of 25 in which individually prescribed instruction was accomplished through a modified team-teaching approach. Two 50-minute periods of reading instruction were scheduled daily for 36 weeks.

Site visited by AIR: 2 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the series.

REGION III

"Reading Project," Follow Through
Goldsboro, North Carolina
(919) 734-0561
(Mrs. Doris P. Shaw)

Far West Regional Laboratory
Berkeley, California
(415) 841-9710
(Dr. Glenn Nimnicht)
(Project is located in Goldsboro, N.C.; contact person is in Berkeley, Calif.)

This project involved all schools in the community in a Follow Through program which was a team teaching approach, ungraded classes in grades one and two, and learning booths for special instruction.

This program was selected as a model program in the Childhood Education Series. It was also written up as an Exemplary Reading Program.

Site visited by AIR: 25 May 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in Childhood Education Series. Separate description of reading program not selected for publication.

* * *

REGION III

"Model School for Developmental Reading Instruction," #67-3407, ESEA, Title III
712 North Eugene Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402
(919) 272-9720
(Mrs. Helen D. Wolff)

This project developed a resource center for demonstration study and evaluation, teacher training, and a model developmental reading program. Federal funds were not available for continuing the program as it was originally organized and major changes were planned for the school year 1970-71. Accordingly, the project was not site visited and was dropped.

REGION IV

"Language Stimulation Program, " Title I, ESEA
Auburn, Alabama

College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004
(713) 748-6600
(John L. Carter)

Telephone conversation indicated that this instructional program was no longer in operation. However, long range data are being collected upon its initial effects. This program utilized language stimulation lessons administered to a small group of educationally disadvantaged children to increase I.Q. and language ability. It was conducted at little or no expense to the school district as part of a dissertation project of Dr. John L. Carter. Its overall effects may bear watching.

It was decided that the project would not be site visited nor would a descriptive report be prepared.

* * *

REGION IV

"Rural County Computer-Related Instructional Technology Project, #68-6399, ESEA, Title III
Post Office Box 98
Crawfordsville, Florida 32327
(904) 926-6161
(Walter Dickson)

This project utilized computer-assisted instruction and specially developed language materials. Students' performance and vocabulary development were monitored by a computer. Colloquial speech patterns were utilized.

Site visited by AIR: 29 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the series.

REGION IV

"Dovack Method for Teaching Reading," #68-6004, Title III, ESEA
P.O. Box 499
Monticello, Florida 32344
(904) 997-2022
(Mrs. Florine Way)

Stories dictated by a group of rural black students (about 40) were used in teaching reading. Extensive records of vocabulary development were maintained.

Site visited by AIR: 2 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in Childhood Education series. Separate description of reading program not selected for publication.

* * *

REGION IV

"Progress Thirteen," #67-3602, ESEA, Title III
P.O. Box 245
Tennille, Georgia 31089
(912) 354-7937
(Mrs. Lydia B. Pool)

Site visited by AIR: 22 June 1970.

This project involved about 100 children in very small remedial reading groups. The project also gave special training to classroom teachers.

Progress Thirteen did not have the funds to continue for the school year 1970-71. It was learned that some counties in the area might start their own reading clinics as an outgrowth of Progress Thirteen, but no definite plans had been made as of the date of the site visit. Teachers who were trained by the program indicated that they would carry on parts of the program on their own in their classes. It was decided not to prepare a final descriptive report since the total program would not be in operation.

REGION IV

"Remedial and Enrichment Program," Title I, ESEA
Thomasville Elementary Schools
Thomasville, Georgia
(912) 226-1601
(Dr. Garfield Wilson)

Site visited by AIR: 24 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Summer Remedial and Enrichment Program, Thomasville, Georgia. 1971.
15 p. HE 5.230:30029 S/N 1780-0780. 20¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION IV

"Early Childhood Education Through Stimulation," 68-6761, ESEA, Title III
Box 220
Gulfport, Mississippi 39501
(601) 864-7176
(Miss Alice Smith)

Site visited by AIR: 29 June 1970.

Two hundred first graders in classes of twenty, each with a teacher and aide, used video tapes and materials which let each child succeed at his own rate.

The director of the Follow Through sponsor, Dr. Charles D. Smock of the University of Georgia, informed AIR that the Follow Through program had been completely restructured, and his staff was preparing a revised statement of the model. Since the program was to be modified for the school year 1970-71, it was decided not to prepare a final descriptive report.

REGION IV

"Dyslexia Classes for Perceptually Handicapped," #67-4991, ESEA, Title III
"Briarwood"
Route 3, Box 100
Natchez, Mississippi 39120

Perceptual Development Center
108 South Commerce Street
Natchez, Mississippi 39120
(601) 44-5132
(Mrs. H. Lee Jones, Jr.)

In this project children were given daily reading instruction on a structured basis with a volunteer in a one-to-one situation with an additional hour for work on specific skills of motor coordination and another hour of "audidory discrimination." There is early identification of children with preceptual difficulty and motor coordination. These youngsters are given special instruction. When sufficient progress was made they were returned to the regular reading program.

This program was selected as a model program in the Childhood Education series. It was also written up as an Exemplary Reading Program.

Site visited by AIR: October 2, 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in Childhood Education Series. Separate description of reading program not published.

* * *

REGION IV

"Reading Clinic for Williamsburg County," #68-6736, ESEA, Title III
P.O. Box 336
Kingstree, South Carolina 59556
(803) 354-7894
(Thurmond D. Holler)

This project developed a reading clinic to provide remedial instruction to 41 black fourth graders on a one-to-one basis for one hour every day for a period of no more than six weeks. Classroom teachers were also given training in teaching reading. This program was to be modified for the 1970-71 school year. Hence, it was decided not to site visit or prepare a descriptive report.

REGION V

"Project Follow Through," Title I, ESEA
East St. Louis, Illinois
(Initially recommended)

Project selected for site visit was:

"Project Conquest," Title I, ESEA
School District 189
931 St. Louis Avenue
East St. Louis, Illinois 62201
(618) 874-2070
(Mrs. Bettye Spann)

Mr. Robert D. Cain, Assistant Superintendent, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, and Mr. Noah S. Neace, Director, Title I, ESEA for the State of Illinois both recommended that the regular Title I, ESEA program (Project Conquest) in East St. Louis be substituted for "Project Follow Through" which had been initially recommended. Project Conquest was designed to help disadvantaged children with normal potential read at their grade level. Three reading clinics located in poverty areas served fourth through sixth graders in the area, and 12 elementary schools had special relocatable reading rooms where first through third graders were given special help.

Site visited by AIR: 7 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Manuscript not selected for publication in the series.

* * *

REGION V

"Programmed Tutorial Reading Project," Title I, ESEA
Roosevelt Annex, 1644 Roosevelt Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46218
(317) 632-3531
(Mrs. Mary Nelson)

Site visited by AIR: 10 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Programmed Tutorial Reading Project, Indianapolis, Indiana. 1971. 15 p.
HE 5.230:30030 S/N 1708-0781 20¢

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

REGION V

"Northwest Multiservice Educational Center," #67-2793, ESEA, Title III
Northwest Indiana Cooperative
P.O. Box 295
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
(219) 462-3111
(Wayne E. Swihart)

This project involved diagnosing children's reading difficulties and giving prescribed treatments to each child's teacher. Preliminary investigation led to the decision not to site visit or prepare a descriptive report.

* * *

REGION V

"Communication Skills Center Project," Title I, ESEA
5057 Woodward
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 922-0132
(Mr. Robert Nagel)

Site visited by AIR: 15 July 1970.

This project provided remedial reading services to educationally disadvantaged children in several elementary and secondary schools.

These Communication Skills Centers have continuously changed their size, organization, and administration over the past four years. It was learned that in 1970-71 the program would no longer be an independent program but would be controlled by the federally funded Neighborhood Education Center project. It seemed premature to describe the program before it had operated for at least a year under the new organization. Hence, a final descriptive report was not prepared.

REGION V

"School and Home Program," Title I, ESEA
Administration Building
Flint Public Schools
Flint, Michigan
(313) 238-1631
(Dr. Mildred B. Smith)

This project, developed for underachieving elementary school children, involved parents in the daily reading exercises and studies of these children. When contact was made by telephone, AIR was advised that the project had been discontinued. Accordingly, the project was not site visited nor was a descriptive report prepared.

* * *

REGION V

"Project Emerge," ESEA, Title VIII
Dayton City Schools
348 West First Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
(513) 461-3850
(Mr. Charles Rivers)

Site visited by AIR: 10 July 1970.

This project sought to reduce the high dropout rate among 200 black students in three model city area schools by improving the students' knowledge and skills and by reducing their problems through supportive services.

AIR site visitors found that the secondary reading component of the project was still in the formative stage and was in operation for only nine weeks during 1969-70. A totally new approach was to be initiated in 1970-71, and it was decided that it would be premature to describe the program.

REGION V

"Elementary Reading Centers," Title I, ESEA
5225 N. Vliet Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
(414) 476-3670
(Melvin Yabow)

Site visited by AIR: 25 May 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1971. 31 p.
HE 5.230:30035 S/N 1780-0786. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION V

"Inner City School Improvement Program," Title I, ESEA
2230 Northwestern Avenue
Racine, Wisconsin
(414) 637-9511
(Alfred Held)

Site visited by AIR: 27 May 1970.

This project established study centers in several public and parochial schools for children who were severely retarded in reading and arithmetic.

AIR site visitors learned that the Racine program would not be continued for the school year 1970-71, so it was decided not to prepare a final descriptive report.

REGION VI

"Keokuk Junior High Small School," #68-5095, ESAA, Title III
Keokuk Junior High School
15th and Main
Keokuk, Iowa 52632
(319) 524-3737
(Miss Ruth Davis)

The title of this project was changed from "Keokuk Junior High Small School" to "School-Within-a-School."

Site visited by AIR: 1 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
School-Within-a-School, Keokuk, Iowa. 1971. 22 p. HE 5.230:30036
S/N 1780-0787. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION VI

"Experimental Motivation in Language Arts," #68-6485, ESEA, Title III
1100 Central
Humbolt, Kansas 66748
(316) 473-2461
(E. Gene Schulze)

Site visited by AIR: 21 May 1970.

The Humboldt program was not actually a reading program, but rather was designed to increase student motivation in language arts through the use of typewriters. The site team did not feel that we should prepare a final descriptive report on this project since the evaluations showed no significant difference between control and experimental groups on language arts performance, although the subjective opinions of students, parents, and teachers were favorable.

REGION VI

"Reading Clinic, Centers, and Services, Including an Inservice Training Program for the Training of Personnel for Staffing the Above-Mentioned Clinic, Centers, and Services," #67-2812, ESEA, Title III

415 West Eighth Street
Topeka, Kansas 66603
(913) 357-0351
(Eldon L. Storer)

Site visited by AIR: 23 June 1970

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
The Topeka Reading Clinic, Centers and Services, Topeka, Kansas. 1971. 26 p. HE 5.230:30032 S/n 1780-0783. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION VI

"Wichita Program for Educationally Deprived Children," Title I, ESEA
428 South Broadway
Wichita, Kansas 67202
(316) 267-8311
(Dr. James Howell)

Site visited by AIR: 26 May 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in the Childhood Education series. Separate description of reading program not selected for publication.

REGION VI

"Responsive Environments Corporation Follow Through Program Project," ESEA, Title I, Follow Through
Switzer Elementary School
1829 Madison Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
(816) 421-4620
(Mrs. Brydie Alsbrook)

This project utilized the "Talking Typewriter" for language development. One hundred five-year-olds from disadvantaged Mexican-American, white Ozark and black families were given instruction in groups of 25 in a nongraded "open" atmosphere. The reading components could not be clearly identified. Hence, it was decided not to site visit or prepare a descriptive report.

* * *

REGION VI

"Language Arts Improvement," Title I, ESEA
P.O. Box 1358
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201
(701) 722-0971
(Dr. Harold Berquist)

Site visited by AIR 26 May 1970

The main goal of the program was to help students develop skills in language arts. Children were diagnosed and given small-group individualized attention by a special reading teacher. The evaluation results did not show that the main goal of the project was being met. Also, at the time of the site visit, it seemed very, very unlikely that the project would continue. It was recommended that a descriptive report not be prepared.

REGION VII

"Developmental Reading Improvement Programs," #67-3373, ESEA, Title III
Donaldsonville, Ascension Parish School Board
Donaldsonville, Louisiana 70346
(504) 473-4225
(Ernest E. Trureau)

Site visited by AIR: 25 June 1970.

This developmental reading program included diagnosis of student needs; extended library services; development of parent-school relationships; and psychological and health services for about 720 students in all grades.

At the time of the site visit, it seemed unlikely that the program would receive funds to continue. The program did not obtain funds for school year 1970-71, so a final descriptive report was not prepared.

* * *

REGION VII

"Project to Provide a Research, Diagnostic, Demonstration and Education Center for Clovis Public Schools and Contiguous Areas," #67-3658, ESEA, Title III
800 Pile
Clovis, New Mexico 88101
(505) 762-2541
(Jack J. Hern)

Site visited by AIR: 12 May 1970.

In this project 838 pupils, mostly in grades 2-5, were brought to a center for 30 minutes' remedial and developmental instruction daily, carried out with no more than five in a group.

During the site visit it was learned that the program would not be continued for the 1970-71 school year. Hence a final descriptive report was not prepared.

REGION VII

"Remedial Reading," Title I, ESEA
Pojoaque School District
P.O. Drawer P
Santa Fe, New Mexico
(505) 455-2284
(Frank B. Lopez)

This project involved forty-two children in an elementary school receiving remedial reading instruction with a variety of materials.

Site visited by AIR: 8 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Remedial Reading Program, Pojoaque, New Mexico. 1971. 22 p. HE 5.230:30037
S/N 1870-0788. 25¢

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

* * *

REGION VII

"Project READ," #3543, ESEA Title III
Superintendent of Schools
221 North Lee
Altus, Oklahoma 73521
(405) 482-4852
(Clifford Peterson)

This project carried on in five small-town elementary schools compared the teaching of reading through the use of the most modern technological equipment and multi-level materials with the conventional method of teaching reading without the aid of modern media or machines. The project was not scheduled for continuation for the 1970-71 school year. Accordingly, the project was neither site visited nor was a descriptive report prepared.

REGION VIII

"Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction," #1032, Title III, ESEA
3690 South 2860 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
(801) 278-4741
(Dr. Ethna R. Reid)

The primary purpose of this project is to improve reading performance of students by inservice training of teachers. Several hundred teachers, principals and specialists from rural and urban elementary schools participated in workshops. The Center serves as a resource agency to teachers.

Site visited by AIR: 15 July 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Descriptive report published in Childhood Education series. Separate description of reading program not selected for publication.

REGION IX

"Malabar Reading Program for Mexican-American Children," Title I, ESEA
Youth Opportunities Foundation
P.O. Box 45762
Los Angeles, California 90045
(213) 670-7664
(Felix Castro)

This program included individualized instruction, curriculum change, parent participation, and cultural activities for children in preschool through the third grade. Investigation indicated that the program had been terminated and was being replaced by an alternate program. Accordingly, it was decided not to site visit, and a descriptive report was not prepared.

* * *

REGION IX

"Bilingual Education," #97-0075, Title VII, ESEA
Marysville Joint Unified School District
504 J Street Del Monte Square
Marysville, California 95901
(916) 743-9267
(Dr. Eleanor Thonis)

Site visited by AIR: 15 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Yuba County Reading-Learning Center, Marysville, California. 1971.
22 p. HE 5.230:30038 S/N 1780-0789. 25¢

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

REGION IX

"Augmented Reading Project," Title I, ESEA
800 South Garey Avenue
Pomona, California 91766
(714) 623-5251
(Dr. Garrett C. Nichols)

This project provided supplemented reading instruction, cultural enrichment activities, and community involvement in the first three grades of six elementary schools.

Site visited by AIR: 8 June 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in series.

* * *

REGION IX

"Exemplary Reading Clinic Program Utilizing An Array of Innovative Approaches," #66-680, Title III, ESEA
3954 - 12th Street
Riverside, California 92501
(714) 684-5110
(Richard C. Robbins)

This project established small classes of children to be taught by a teacher and an aide. Emphasis was upon reading skills through individualized instruction. Tangible rewards were given for successful work. AIR was advised that the project had been terminated at the end of the 1968-69 school year. Accordingly, the project was neither site visited nor was a descriptive report prepared.

REGION IX

"Project R-3," Title I, ESEA
Office of Compensatory Education
1108 O Street
Sacramento, California
(Mrs. Ruth Holloway)

Project carried out in:

Woodrow Wilson Junior High School
San Jose School District
1605 Park Avenue
San Jose, California
(408) 293-5303
(Mr. William Doyle)

This project emphasized student readiness, subject relevance, and learning reinforcement (hence the 3-R's). The project sought to help junior high school students from predominantly disadvantaged backgrounds.

Site visited by AIR: 25 May 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in series.

APPENDIX E

Five Exemplary Reading Programs in Adult Basic Education Selected for Site Visits and Documentation from Recommendations of the Division of Adult Education Programs, United States Office of Education

"Bexar County Adult Basic Education Program"

Bexar County Court House Annex
203 West Nueva Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207
(512) 227-0197
(Mr. Robert A. Avina)

This program attacks the problem of adult illiteracy which is a major problem in San Antonio where there is an estimated 180,000 functional illiterates. In 1969-70 the program served over 8,000 adults, mostly Mexican-Americans, through a variety of programs which ranged from classes in all-day learning centers and part-time evening centers to a research and demonstration project investigating the sources of hard-core adult illiteracy.

Site visited by AIR: 21 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Des Moines Area Community College Adult Education Program"

2006 Ankeny Boulevard
Ankeny, Iowa 50021
(515) 964-0651
(Mr. Nick Belivi)

The Des Moines Area Community Colleges, serving 11 counties with approximately 20% of the population of the state of Iowa, is the nucleus of an educational system including career education, general education in the arts and science or the equivalent of the junior college, and adult and continuing education. The Adult and Continuing Education Division operates four main programs, all of which emphasize reading instruction: the adult basic education program, the high school equivalency program, the adult high school diploma program and community service programs, and the continuing education program.

Site visited by AIR: 21 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Pima County Adult Basic Education Program"

Pima County Superintendent of Schools
131 West Congress
Tucson, Arizona 85701
(602) 792-8905
(Mr. Edward L. Lindsey)

This project served approximately 1,300 adults in the area of Tucson, Arizona. Most of the adults are from poverty-level income groups, and many are Mexican-Americans. The program offers them classes in Adult Basic Education and English as a second language, designed to help them achieve literacy and the educational background needed for employment or future schooling. The recruitment, training, and use of volunteers is a significant feature of the program.

Site visited by AIR: 19 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Caminemos Adult Learning Center"

69 Park Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06611
(203) 249-7975
(Mr. William Daredo)

This project involved over 200 Spanish-speaking adults, many of whom had recently come to the United States. They attended classes regularly in conversational English in a former shoe store that had been converted to a learning center. "Caminemos" in Spanish, "Let's walk together," is a cooperative effort by the State Department of Education, the Hartford Board of Education, and a community advisory committee to teach English as a second language.

Site visited by AIR: 12 October 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 4 January 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Mead Packaging Company Adult Education Program"

950 West Marietta Street, N.W.
Atlanta Georgia 30318
(404) 875-2711
(Mr. Robert Ervin)

This project was an industry developed program designed to recruit and train disadvantaged people who were previously considered unemployable and to make them productive employees. The primary goal was to train, employ, and retain 180 workers for a period of six months. After only 21 months, 195 of the program's graduates had met the six-month retention criteria, surpassing the goal by 15 men.

Site visited by AIR: 2 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 8 January 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 8 January 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

APPENDIX F

Six Exemplary Reading Programs Identified by the American Institutes for Research and Approved by United States Office of Education as Substitutes for Programs Eliminated from Initial List Supplied by the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

"Bloom Township High School Reading Program"

Junior-Senior Division
10th and Dixie Highway
Chicago Heights, Illinois 60411
(312) 755-1122
(Mrs. Leitha Paulsen)

Bloom Township High School provides a comprehensive reading program on the high school level, including a reading clinic for students with serious reading disabilities, a reading laboratory for students at all levels of reading proficiency, and a program of individually prescribed study (IPS) involving reading in specific content areas, which is the focus of this report. A student whose reading problems are hindering his progress in a specific subject is referred by the teacher to IPS, where he pursues a sequence of self-directed instructional activities designed to help him successfully complete the course. The referring teacher and a special reading aide work together to plan an appropriate program for the student, which includes work on vocabulary of the subject area and readings which parallel the course content but are on a simpler reading level.

Site visited by AIR: 18 January 1971.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.
For sale by Superintendent of Documents.
Bloom Township High School Reading Program, Chicago Heights, Illinois.
1971. 27 p. HE 5.230:30033 S/N 1780-0784. 25¢.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

"Project PLAN"

Wood County Schools
Parkersburg, West Virginia
(304) 422-8411
(Mr. Ernest Page, Jr.)
also
Westinghouse Learning Corporation
2680 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, California 94302
(415) 493-3550

In Parkersburg, West Virginia, Project PLAN (Program for Learning in Accordance with Needs) offers an individualized instructional system designed to enable each student to progress at his own rate, using the learning method and the instructional materials best suited to him.

Project PLAN operates in existing school facilities and with commercially available materials. A unique feature, computer management of the student's program of studies and of various non-teaching tasks, frees the teacher to devote her time to facilitating the learning of individual students. As presently developed, Project PLAN focuses on the basic subjects of reading and language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. In addition, a special guidance curriculum encourages students to do their own planning, decision making, and management of classroom time, and provides an introduction to the wider worlds of work, leisure, and citizenship.

Site visited by AIR: 12 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final Leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Published in Childhood Education series. Description of reading program not published in reading series.

"Communications Skills Program"

Southwest Regional Laboratory
11300 La Cienega Boulevard
Inglewood, California 90304
(213) 776-3800
(Dr. Robert W. O'Hare)

The Communication Skills Program is a comprehensive set of materials and procedures designed by Southwest Regional Laboratory to teach the basic skills of English language communication. The beginning reading program, called First-Year Communication Skills Program, is for kindergarten students and includes four supplementary programs. A Second-Year Communication Skills Program, for first grade students, is also available, and programs for grades two and three are being developed. About 33,000 children in 12 states are now learning through the Communication Skills Program.

Site visited by AIR: 18 September 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Starter/101"

Reading Center
4121 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011
(202) 723-1665
(Mrs. Eva Lofty)

Through the use of materials called "Starter/101," the public schools of Washington, D.C., are providing special reading instruction for non readers. The materials were designed to fill a gap between readiness and beginning reading programs and to help children acquire the skills necessary for them to begin regular published programs. First used in the 1969-70 school year, Starter/101 was in 1970-71 being utilized by 27 instructional personnel in Washington for work with 153 children in grades 1 through 6.

Site visited by AIR: 12 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Total Reading"

Monterey Peninsula Unified School District
P.O. Box 1031
Monterey, California
(408) 649-7011
(Dr. Henry Hutchins)

Total Reading, used in over 100 primary classrooms in the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District, teaches a simple vowel code which enables the child to decode words independently. The child first learns to read and write isolated sounds, progressing to individual words, short sentences, and finally to stories and books. Children are encouraged to read library books at home and in school and to express themselves in oral and written work. Total Reading has been particularly successful in teaching disadvantaged pupils to read.

Site visited by AIR: 24 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

"Project READ"
Gary, Indiana

Administered by:
Behavioral Research Laboratories
P.O. Box 577
Palo Alto, California 94302
(415) 854-4400
(Dr. Allen Calvin)

Project READ was being used with 3,500 elementary school students in Gary, Indiana, during 1970-71. Offered by Behavioral Research Laboratories, Project READ features a linguistic, decoding approach to reading, programmed textbooks that allow for individualized instruction, and pre-service and inservice training of teachers.

Site visited by AIR: 13 November 1970.

Final descriptive manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 12 February 1971.

Final leaflet manuscript delivered to Office of Education: 16 February 1971.

Not selected for publication in the reading series.

APPENDIX G

Inventory Forms for Data Collected for Exemplary Reading Programs

School System Code # _____

Interviewers: _____

_____

Date of Visit _____

READING
Program Identification

Level 1

What is the program title?

What is its location (town, state)?

What school district(s)?

What are the names of program director and his deputy and their addresses?

What is their phone number?

What is the main program emphasis? remedial accelerated other

What are its stated goals and objectives?

In what documents is it described? Price of document?

Are there any audiovisual presentation materials available?

Who should be contacted for further information and their addresses?

Through whom can visits be arranged?

Are there special considerations for living accommodations, transportation, or program visitor policies?

Cost of Program School System _____

Level 2

What is the total cost of the program, and is that an annual figure?

What proportion of the funding for the costs of the reading program is:

Federal? State? Local? Other?

What costs would be involved in initiating the program (such as new buildings, property, buses, equipment, materials, in-service training, consultant fees, and other)?

What costs would be involved in sustaining the program (such as salaries, evaluation services, replacement of equipment and materials - for example, are 25% of materials and equipment replaced each year?)?

What are the indirect (overhead) costs associated with the program (such as maintenance, utilities, office services, and other)?

What amount of space is needed for the program? (Report in average classroom size, such as one-half average classroom size, double class size, etc.)

For instruction

Administration and office space

Level 1

What is the per student cost comparison between program and control or base group cost? (What formula is used to arrive at these figures?)

What is an estimate of the program costs absorbed by the district and not charged to the program (such as telephone, travel, etc.)

School System _____

Community Factors

Level 1

How would you describe the community served by the program groups?

Socio-Economic%

	Low	Medium	High	
Non-metropolitan	____% (up to $6,000)	____% ($6,000 to $13,000)	____% ($13,000 and up)	= 100%
or				
Metropolitan	____% (up to $6,500)	____% ($6,500 to $15,000)	____% ($15,000 and up)	= 100%

What is an estimate of the average annual income of a family in the community?

Ethnic show%

black	Spanish surname	other minority	white	
_____	_____	_____	_____	= 100%

Is there a second language or strong dialect influence in the community? What problems does it present?

What indications are there of parent support of the program? Control group?

Are parents involved in the program? How?

Most appropriate descriptions of the community and the citizenry and the major occupational groups, transient or permanent, % on welfare, % unemployed, etc.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____

School System _____

School District Characteristics

How many schools are there in the District?

How many students are there in the District?

What is the organizational pattern of the schools?

What "innovative" programs or procedures have been started during the last five years? (Are program students involved in some of these programs?)

What is the minimum and maximum amount paid on the teachers' salary schedule?

What is the average class size?

What is the average teacher - pupil ratio?

What actions of the District Board of Education members have influenced the program?

What is the average I.Q. of the pupils?

What is the cost per year per child in the District as a whole? (What formula is used to arrive at this figure?)

What is the general financial status of the school system?

School System _____

Characteristics of Schools in Program

Level 1

How would you characterize each of the schools in terms of size of student body served; physical plant? (Refer to chart)

Have any of the facilities been constructed or altered especially to accommodate the program?

Is bussing involved in the program? How? (average time spent on bus, mileage, etc.)

School System _____

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN PROGRAMS

Names of Schools Involved	School Size Total Number Enrolled	Number of Pupils in Program	Physical Plant Condition Better than average (B) Average (A) Poorer than average (P)	Unique Program Variants Other, etc. (describe)	Amount of Space (in average classroom units)

Major Types of Personnel Involved in the Program

Title	Qualifications (Academic and Experience)	Major Duties	How they were Selected

School System _____

Personnel in Program

What are the characteristics possessed by instructional personnel?

(age)

(sex)

(ethnic)

(language)

(other)

What is teacher attrition in program? (%)

What special training is provided in the program? (length, content, presented by, etc.)

Is there in-service training? (such as work shops, group meetings, use of video-tape or other feedback, etc.)

Are special consultants or sponsors used in the program? What is their role?

School System _____

Personnel:	Program		Control or Base Group	
	No.	Total hrs. of Program Contract/ Week (ave.)	No.	Total hrs. of Program Contract/ week
District Administrators	___	___	___	___
School Administrators	___	___	___	___
Special Consultants (from outside) Specify Function	___	___	___	___
Research Evaluators	___	___	___	___
Curriculum specialists (target subjects)	___	___	___	___
Curriculum specialists (supplementary subjects)	___	___	___	___
Group Leaders	___	___	___	___
Certified teachers	___	___	___	___
Provisional teachers	___	___	___	___
Teacher-interns	___	___	___	___
Teacher aides (paid)	___	___	___	___
Teacher aides (volunteer)	___	___	___	___
School Psychologists	___	___	___	___
Speech therapists	___	___	___	___
Reading therapists	___	___	___	___
Counselors	___	___	___	___
Social workers	___	___	___	___
Medical doctors	___	___	___	___
School Nurses	___	___	___	___
Attendance officers	___	___	___	___
Librarians	___	___	___	___
Library aides (paid)	___	___	___	___
Library aides (volunteer)	___	___	___	___
Secretaries	___	___	___	___
Clerical assistants	___	___	___	___
Other	___	___	___	___

School System _____

Pupil Characteristics

Level 1

	Program	Control or Base
How many pupils are there?		
At what actual grade levels?		
At what functional reading grade level?		
What is the mean age?		
What is the % black% What is the % Spanish surname? What is the % other minorities? What is the % white? What is the % of High income? What is the % of Middle income? What is the % of Low income?		
What is the M:F ratio?		
What is the proportion of pupils for whom English is a second language?		
What is the physiological status of the pupils? (physical handicaps if common to group)		
What is the emotional behavior status of the students? (disciplinary or other)		
What % of the pupils have had pre-school educational experience? (Examples)		

School System _____

Learner Activities and Methodology

	Program	Control or Base
Level 1		
What proportion of the time do learners spend in the following learning situations?		
Individual		
Small groups (2 - 7)		
Medium groups (8 - 20)		
Large groups (21 and over)		
What is the typical teacher : student ratio? What is the typical teacher aide : student ratio? What innovative technologies, if any, are employed for instructional purposes?		
Is there any centralized "learning center" in the school used by the students? Is its use optional or specified?		
What innovative instructional practices have been developed or implemented successfully?		
What are the main learner activities? 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.		
What provisions are made for supplemental (tutorial) instruction outside the regular school program?		
Are there differences in the reward system between program and control classes? What is the grading system?		
Level 2		
What are the important instructional materials used in the program? (chart)		

School System _____

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

Name of material	Cost per unit	Ratio copies to pupils	Assoc. Equip. required	Appropriate Grade Level	Appropriate maturity level	Ethnic or language relevance	Source	Remarks
Texts								
Kits								
A V media								
Locally prepared								
Other								

School System _____

Measurement and Evaluation

Level 1

What are the selection procedures for pupils? (program) (control)
(Have the pupils been randomly assigned to treatment groups?)

What are the drop out rates during the program? (program) (control)

Why did the students drop out? Were new students added?
Did some students have poor attendance records?
How were these factors dealt with in the evaluation?

Level 2

What person or group was primarily responsible for the testing and evaluation?

What tests were used (name, edition, and form), with what results? (chart)
(Background information on "hard" data; prepared for whom and the reason)

Who administered the tests and on what dates?

What are the known differences, if any, in test administration procedures for the program and control pupils?

Is data collected from parents, faculty, and students other than by test? What data?

School System _____

Measurement and Evaluation

Level 3

What are the most important findings of the formal testing program?

What are the apparent changes in students' cognitive skills due to involvement in the program?

Has it had broader impact for the learners than simply improving their reading? (other subjects)

What are the changes in students' attitudes due to involvement in the program?

What are the attitudes of school mates to students in this program?

What are the changes in students' educational aspirations due to involvement in the program?

What other important changes in student behavior have occurred?

TESTING RESULTS

School System _____

Measurement Instrument Name, Edition, and Form	Central tendency and Dispersion				Number students		Statistical technique used	Conclusions (sig. level if approp.)	Remarks (pre-post time interval, etc.)
	Pre-test		Post-test						
	Program	control	program	control	program	control			
Reading Achievement									
_____									
_____									
Self Concept									
_____									
_____									
Intelligence									
_____									
_____									
Personality									
_____									
_____									
Motor skills									
_____									
_____									
Local Diagnostic									
Other									

School System _____

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Level 2

Briefly describe:

How long has the program been in operation?

What person or persons in the District were instrumental in creating the program? How? When?

What changes have been made in the goals or emphasis of the program since it was initiated?

What are the plans for the program for the next few years?

If you were to start the program now, what would you do differently?

Is there a guiding committee on a standing basis? Composition?

School System _____

Supervisory and Instructional Practices

Level 2

What supervisory practices seem to have contributed most to the program?

What changes in supervisory practices $\frac{\text{will}}{\text{might}}$ be undertaken to improve the program?

What instructional practices seem to have contributed most to the program?

What changes in instructional practices $\frac{\text{will}}{\text{might}}$ be undertaken to improve the program?

What changes in overall program design, measurement, or other aspect $\frac{\text{will}}{\text{would}}$ you implement?

What program feature (or features), in your opinion, might successfully be implemented elsewhere? (describe)

How will the program continue next year?